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I. DECISION

The State of Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) intends to implement the Proposed Action, which involves infrastructure improvements at the Branford Shore Line East (SLE) Railroad Station. The improvements will include:

- A new north-side high level rail platform located opposite the existing south-side high level rail platform
- A new pedestrian bridge over the active rail line that will connect the north-side and south-side platforms. The new pedestrian bridge will include elevators to satisfy the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- A new 316-space surface parking lot located on an undeveloped parcel to the west of the existing 201-space surface parking lot. The new surface parking lot will be fully illuminated and include direct pedestrian connections (walkways and ramps) to the existing south-side high level rail platform. Access to the new parking lot will be obtained from the existing station entrance at the Maple Street/Indian Neck Avenue signalized intersection.
- A new kiss-and-ride drop off area located to the north of the existing rail corridor with direct pedestrian connections (walkways and ramps) to the station via the new north-side high level rail platform. The kiss-and-ride drop off area will be constructed subsequent to the north-side high level rail platform as the property will first be used as a staging area for platform construction.
- Re-use of the former rail station parking lot located north of the rail corridor along Meadow Street. The parking lot will be re-paved and re-striped to provide approximately 52 spaces that will function as overflow parking for the new station. New pedestrian connections from the overflow parking lot to the station will include walkways, stairwells, and a crosswalk at Kirkham Street.

This decision is based on the Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE) (Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc., February, 2009) that was prepared for the Proposed Action and the mitigation commitments it contains including those clarified or further detailed in the responses made to public or agency comments. Those comments were received during the August 7, 2008 public hearing and the public review and comment period held between July 8, 2008 and August 21, 2008. A copy of the EIE Executive Summary is included as Appendix A of this Record of Decision. The responses to comments received are contained in Appendix F.

CTDOT is in the process of making strategic infrastructure and service improvements to the Shore Line East (SLE) commuter rail service so that it will be fully capable of meeting future commuter rail passenger needs. The purpose of the Proposed Action relates directly to CTDOT’s ongoing commitment to expand commuter rail services in
keeping with Governor M. Jodi Rell’s Transportation Initiative, which was passed by the Connecticut Legislature in 2005. The Proposed Action will provide infrastructure improvements to the existing Branford SLE Railroad Station, which opened in August 2005.

The need for the Proposed Action is two-fold:

1) There is an increasing customer service need as demonstrated by steadily increasing SLE ridership numbers. Connecticut’s residents are utilizing the state rail service for in-state travel as well as for travel to and from New York City. This has been precipitated by:
   - Increased development pressures in coastal and southeastern Connecticut;
   - Increased congestion on coastal roadway corridors including I-95 and U.S. Route 1;
   - Rapidly fluctuating gas prices;
   - An increasingly mobile workforce; and
   - Improved commuter rail infrastructure.

The result is that existing parking facilities at SLE railroad stations can no longer meet the demand. CTDOT’s goal is to provide between 400 and 500 parking spaces at each SLE commuter rail station in order to accommodate future patrons. At the Branford Railroad Station, the 201-space parking lot that was constructed in 2005 is already at capacity, indicating an immediate need to provide additional parking at the station.

2) For commuters taking SLE, Governor Rell has announced improved service to and from New Haven and for reverse commuting to Old Saybrook in the near future. Improved service east of New Haven is an important component in reducing traffic congestion and improving mobility in southeastern Connecticut. To efficiently and effectively provide this enhanced service, there is the need to construct north-side high level rail platforms at each of the existing SLE stations, thereby making each station a full service dual-platform station. The need is driven by existing lease agreements between CTDOT and Amtrak. Under current lease agreements, CTDOT is obligated to construct high-level rail platforms on both sides of the rail corridor at each SLE station if it wants to provide commuter service outside the current rush hour periods. Thus, in order to meet Amtrak lease requirements and to provide bi-directional service, a new north-side high level rail platform at the Branford SLE Station and at other SLE stations is necessary if future expansion of SLE service is to succeed.

Two alternatives were assessed in the EIE; a Build Alternative and the No-Action Alternative. Because existing lease agreements between Amtrak and CTDOT stipulate that future expansion of SLE service beyond the current peak periods cannot occur
without constructing dual high-level rail platforms at each SLE station, and because the parking lot at the existing Branford SLE Station is at capacity, the Build Alternative is the only alternative that will successfully meet the stated purpose and need for the Proposed Action.

In addition, given the existing rail station configuration, rail line constraints, and lease agreements between Amtrak and CTDOT, the use of an alternative site is not prudent or feasible to meet the project purpose and need. Because rail is a fixed system, land available for the Proposed Action must be located immediately adjacent to the rail corridor and existing station in order to gain maximum benefit from the project and its intended use. As described above, the north-side high level rail platform must be located opposite the existing south-side platform in order for optimal functionality, and parking expansion options are limited to only those parcels within a short and safe walking distance of the station.

Project construction cost is anticipated to range from $20 to $25 million, with start of construction in January 2010. This cost represents a midpoint of construction (2010) dollars. The facility is scheduled to be open and operational by spring of 2011.

II. STATEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The Proposed Action is essential for increasing the efficiency of operations at the SLE Railroad Station in Branford and is an important part of meeting future transportation demands in southeastern Connecticut. Potential adverse effects from the Proposed Action include:

- Minor visual impacts to adjacent land uses located north of the railroad tracks along Elm Street and Kirkham Street
- Loss of 5.38 acres of vacant undeveloped land that is currently under private ownership and which is designated as a coastal flood hazard area (100-year coastal floodplain). Some fill will be placed in the 100-year coastal floodplain that will result locally in a minor loss of flood storage capacity.
- Acquisition of a 0.65-acre private residential parcel that is partially within the coastal flood hazard area
- Approximately 0.02 acres (720 SF) will be impacted below the high tide line during the replacement of an existing undersized and partially clogged 12-inch RCP culvert with a new open bottom span or arch culvert. The new open bottom span or arch culvert will improve tidal exchange in adjacent tidal wetlands to the north
- Introduction of 2.88 acres (125,450 SF) of new paved surface which has the potential to affect water quality
- Construction-period impacts relative to noise, air quality, energy usage, and stormwater among others, and
• Potential for exposure of construction workers to suspected subsurface contamination on the 5.38 acre parcel that will be developed as a new 316-space surface parking lot.

These impacts will be mitigated through landscaping, proper management of materials and resources during and after construction, and by adhering to all applicable state, and federal regulations related to coastal resource protection, floodplain management, erosion and sedimentation control, and stormwater runoff/water quality treatment/management. CTDOT will also develop plans and specifications to address any on-site contamination issues. These plans will include material handling and disposal requirements. A Health and Safety Plan will also be developed and implemented in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) guidelines to ensure that construction workers are protected from potential contamination and other hazards.

Coordination with resource agencies, including the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (CTDEP) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), among others, will continue throughout the duration of the project to ensure that all regulatory requirements are met. Through its impact avoidance and mitigation measures, the Proposed Action will not incur any significant environmental, cultural, or social impacts.

III. SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION WITH AGENCIES AND OTHER PERSONS

Per Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (CEPA) requirements, a scoping notice for the Proposed Action was placed in Connecticut’s Environmental Monitor on June 5, 2007. A Public Scoping Meeting was not conducted for this project as such a meeting was not requested by 25 or more individuals or by an association that represents 25 or more members during the 30 day scoping comment period. Only three resource agencies, the CTDEP, the Connecticut Commission on Culture and Tourism – Historic Preservation and Museum Division, and the Connecticut Department of Public Health (CTDPH) provided scoping comments during the 30 day comment period.

During data collection efforts involved in the documentation of existing environmental conditions, several federal and state resource agencies were contacted for information as were local officials in the Town of Branford. A copy of the CEPA public scoping notice as well as responses received during the formal public scoping period (June 5, 2007 through July 19, 2007) are included in Appendix B. Important agency and local correspondence is also included in Appendix B.

The Draft EIE was made available for public review and comment from July 8, 2008 to August 21, 2008. Notice of Draft EIE availability and public hearing was placed in Connecticut’s Environmental Monitor on July 8, 2008. Additionally, notice of Draft EIE
availability and public hearing was advertised in the New Haven Register on July 8, July 22, and August 5, 2008. Notices and Affidavits are included in Appendix C. The Draft EIE was made available for public review at the following locations:

- Connecticut Department of Transportation Offices in Newington, Connecticut
- Branford Town Clerk’s Office
- James Blackstone Memorial Library in Branford, Connecticut
- South Central Regional Council of Governments Office in North Haven, Connecticut

A public hearing was advertised and held at the James Blackstone Memorial Library in Branford at 7:00 PM on August 7, 2008. A transcript of the public hearing is included in Appendix D. Written comments received during the public comment period (July 8, 2008 through August 21, 2008) are included in Appendix E. Responses to these comments, as well as comments made during the public hearing are provided in Appendix F.
APPENDIX A

*Environmental Impact Evaluation* (EIE), Executive Summary
(Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc., February, 2009)
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Project Name:** Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station, Branford, Connecticut (State Project Nos. 310-0047 and 310-0048)

**Date:** February, 2009

**Sponsoring Agency:** Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT)

**Participating Agency:** None

**Preparer:** Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc., 72 Cedar Street, Hartford, Connecticut 06106

**Project Description – The Proposed Action**

CTDOT is in the process of making strategic infrastructure and service improvements to the Shore Line East (SLE) commuter rail service from New Haven to New London so that it will be fully capable of meeting future commuter rail passenger needs. The Proposed Action being evaluated in this EIE includes infrastructure improvements at the Branford SLE Railroad Station, which opened in August 2005. The footprint of the Proposed Action is depicted on Figure ES-1. As shown in Figure ES-1, the study site is roughly bounded by Elm Street on the north, Harbor Street on the west, Curve Street on the south and Indian Neck Avenue on the east. Figure ES-1 also illustrates the relationship of the Proposed Action to the existing SLE station and its surroundings. Progress design drawings depicting details of the Proposed Action, prepared by Baker Engineering in April 2008, are included in Appendix A.

The Proposed Action improvements include:

- A new north-side high level rail platform located directly opposite the existing south-side high level rail platform. This project element is highlighted in yellow on progress design drawings 310-0047 C-102, and drawings 310-0048 C-101, C-102, and C-103 included in Appendix A.

- A new pedestrian bridge over the active rail line that will connect the north-side and south-side platforms. The new pedestrian bridge will include elevators to satisfy the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). This project element is highlighted in red on progress design drawings 310-0047 C-102 and C-105, and drawings 310-0048 C-101, C-102, and C-103 included in Appendix A.

- A new 316-space surface parking lot located on a vacant undeveloped parcel to the west of the existing 201-space surface parking lot. The new surface lot will be fully
illuminated and include direct pedestrian connections (walkways and ramps) to the existing south-side high level rail platform. Access to the new parking lot will be obtained from the existing station entrance at the Maple Street/Indian Neck Avenue signalized intersection. The new surface parking lot is highlighted in green on progress design drawings 310-0047 C102, C103, and C105 included in Appendix A.

- A new kiss-and-ride drop off area located to the north of the existing rail corridor with direct pedestrian connections (walkways and ramps) to the station via the new north-side high level rail platform. The kiss-and-ride drop off area will be constructed subsequent to the north-side high level rail platform as the property will first be used as a staging area for platform construction. The new kiss-and-ride drop off area is highlighted in blue on progress design drawings 310-0048 C101, C102, and C103 included in Appendix A.

- Re-use of the former rail station parking lot located north of the rail corridor along Meadow Street (access to the lot is presently blocked by guard rails). The parking lot will be repaved and re-stripped to provide approximately 52 spaces that will function as overflow parking for the new station located west of Kirkham Street. New pedestrian connections from the overflow parking lot to the new station will include walkways, stairwells, and a crosswalk on Kirkham Street. The former rail station parking lot is highlighted in grey on progress design drawings 310-0047 C-101B, and C-102B included in Appendix A.

Project construction cost is anticipated to range from $20 to $25 million, with start of construction in January 2010. This cost represents a midpoint of construction (2010) dollars. The facility is scheduled to be open and operational by Spring of 2011.
Project Background

SLE trains are owned and operated by CTDOT under contract with the Northeast Passenger Railroad Corporation (Amtrak) to provide daily rail operations. SLE commuter rail operations began in May of 1990 serving seven stations along a 33-mile segment of Amtrak’s Northeast Corridor between New Haven and Old Saybrook. The service was extended by CTDOT eastward to New London in 1996. SLE service operates in the peak direction only and in the morning connects at New Haven, Bridgeport and Stamford stations for Metro-North service to New York City’s Grand Central Terminal.

Since its inception, there has been a steady increase in SLE ridership but recently, starting in 2005, a marked increase in ridership has occurred. According to a January 1, 2007 CTDOT report to the Governor entitled, “Expanding Rail Service on Shore Line East,” the average monthly ridership on SLE in 2004 was 33,786, and was 35,289 in 2005. The average monthly ridership through September 2006 was 38,207, which is more than eight percent higher than 2005 levels. In June 2006, ridership on SLE surpassed the five million mark. CTDOT’s Statewide Travel Model estimates an annual growth in ridership of approximately four percent annually without factoring in any further SLE improvements or service expansion. Thus, the upward trend in ridership is expected to continue into 2008 and beyond, especially as improvements are made to the SLE service, congestion on Interstate 95 worsens, and gas prices continue to fluctuate. Overall, Governor M. Jodi Rell and CTDOT are committed to meeting the future needs of commuters as evidenced by the many infrastructure and service improvements that have been and continue to be implemented along the SLE corridor.

SLE infrastructure improvements that have already occurred include the construction of new train stations at Branford, Clinton, and Guilford, which all opened in 2005. These stations were constructed to replace the older lower platform decks. The lower platform decks required train conductors to exit trains at each station stop to lower stairs that allowed passengers to board. Special portable handicap access ramps also had to be deployed as needed. This inefficient procedure significantly prolonged each station stop, causing service delays. The new SLE stations have increased access and service to the commuters, improving functions such as handicapped accessibility, high-level platforms to allow for level and efficient boarding of trains, a commuter shelter area, a convenient commuter drop off area, increased parking and enhanced lighting. In addition to these three stations, new stations are also being built at Madison and Westbrook. Phase I of the Madison station was opened on July 28, 2008 and the Westbrook station is scheduled for completion by the end of 2011. Along with station improvements, CTDOT has also initiated a SLE rail car refurbishing program that involved the purchase and subsequent refurbishing of Virginia Railway Express cars to provide an additional 2,000 seats to meet increased ridership demands. Also, in November 2007, CTDOT initiated an inaugural weekend and holiday service schedule which culminated on December 30, 2007 and started up again in November 2008. All of these actions demonstrate CTDOT’s commitment to improving SLE commuter rail service well into the future.

With regard to the Branford SLE Station that was constructed and opened for service in August 2005, that project involved building the south-side high level rail platform in addition to a commuter shelter and 201-space surface parking lot. In order to expand SLE service to facilitate
future bi-directional service as called for in the January 1, 2007 CTDOT report to the Governor, CTDOT is obligated under current lease agreements with Amtrak to construct high-level rail platforms on both sides of the rail corridor at each SLE station. This is required if CTDOT wants to provide commuter service outside the current rush hour periods. Thus, a new north-side high-level rail platform at the Branford SLE Station and at other SLE stations is necessary. The double platform configuration will benefit commuters in that: 1) a two-sided station will increase ridership and therefore reduce traffic congestion on coastal roadway corridors by allowing for two-way commuting on the SLE corridor, and 2) having two platforms allows more flexibility in how trains are scheduled and will allow additional trains to operate on the line in the future.

The Proposed Action at the Branford SLE Station has a two-fold objective; to construct a new north-side high level rail platform in order to provide a full-service dual-platform commuter station; and to construct expanded parking to accommodate future commuters as ridership continues to grow. The new platform and parking area will be financed with state funds, and as such, is subject to the regulations and guidance established by the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (CEPA) (Connecticut General Statutes [CGS] Sections 22a-1 through 22a-1h, inclusive, and where applicable, CEPA regulations Section 22a-1a-1 through 22a-1a-12, inclusive, of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies [RCSA]). Under CEPA, the document to be prepared is an Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE). The lead state agency for CEPA documentation is CTDOT.

**Purpose and Need**

The purpose of the Proposed Action relates directly to CTDOT’s ongoing commitment to expand commuter rail services in keeping with Governor M. Jodi Rell’s Transportation Initiative, which was passed by the Connecticut Legislature in 2005. CTDOT’s commitment involves implementing various projects, such as the Proposed Action, which will make commuter rail services modern, reliable, and convenient so that the future transportation needs of Connecticut’s residents are met. The provision of premium commuter rail service is considered a key aspect in promoting the economy as well as a high quality of life in Connecticut. With more people commuting by rail to and from their workplace, fewer commuters will be traveling in their cars making for less congestion and a safer environment. The goal of enhancing commuter rail service is a common theme found in state, regional and local plans of development. Transportation improvements that are consistent with various plans of conservation and development lead to increased travel options, better transportation systems, increased economic vitality and containment of sprawl.

The need for the Proposed Action is two-fold:

There is an increasing customer service need as demonstrated by steadily increasing SLE ridership numbers (refer to Project Background section for specifics). Connecticut’s residents are utilizing the state rail service for in-state travel as well as for travel to and from New York City. This has been precipitated by:

- Increased development pressures in coastal and southeastern Connecticut
• Increased congestion on coastal roadway corridors including I-95 and U.S. Route 1
• Rapidly fluctuating gas prices
• An increasingly mobile workforce; and
• Improved commuter rail infrastructure.

The result is that existing parking facilities at SLE railroad stations can no longer meet the demand. CTDOT’s goal is to provide between 400 and 500 parking spaces at each SLE commuter rail station in order to accommodate future patrons. At the Branford Railroad Station, the 201-space parking lot that was constructed in 2005 is already at capacity, indicating an immediate need to provide additional parking at the station.

For commuters taking SLE, Governor Rell has announced improved service to and from New Haven and for reverse commuting to Old Saybrook in the near future. Improved service east of New Haven is an important component in reducing traffic congestion and improving mobility in Southeastern Connecticut. To efficiently and effectively provide this enhanced service, there is the need to construct north-side high level rail platforms at each of the existing SLE stations, thereby making each station a full service dual-platform station. The need is driven by existing lease agreements between CTDOT and Amtrak. Under current lease agreements, CTDOT is obligated to construct high-level rail platforms on both sides of the rail corridor at each SLE station if CTDOT wants to provide commuter service outside the current rush hour periods. Thus, in order to meet Amtrak lease requirements and to provide bi-directional service, a new north-side high level rail platform at the Branford SLE Station and at other SLE stations is necessary if future expansion of SLE service is to succeed.

**Alternative Actions**

Two alternatives are assessed in this EIE; a Build Alternative and the No-Action Alternative. Because existing lease agreements between Amtrak and CTDOT stipulate that future expansion of SLE service beyond the current peak periods cannot occur without constructing dual high-level rail platforms at each SLE station, and because the parking lot at the existing Branford SLE Station is at capacity, the Build Alternative is the only alternative that will successfully meet the stated purpose and need defined above. The Build and No-Action alternatives are discussed below.

**Build Alternative**

In order to successfully meet the purpose and need, infrastructure improvements must occur at the existing Branford SLE Railroad Station that was constructed and opened in August 2005. For instance, a new north-side high level rail platform must be physically located opposite the existing south-side platform in order for optimum rail station functionality to be achieved. Retrofitting the south-side high level rail platform to incorporate temporary platform extensions to service trains operating on the northern track is not a viable option. Operation of these extensions is time consuming and cumbersome, requires manpower, and therefore introduces the potential for human error which could potentially result in scheduling conflicts with Amtrak’s Acela and other conventional train services. Surface parking, however, can potentially be
located within any of the four quadrants surrounding the station as long as the distance from the parking lot to the station is not considered too far, inconvenient, or unsafe for commuter rail passengers to walk. For this reason, a Parking Feasibility Study was conducted by H.W. Lochner, Inc., (July, 2001) on behalf of CTDOT for the Branford SLE Railroad Station as well as for the other proposed stations along SLE. The study considered potential options for accommodating upwards of 400 to 500 parking spaces at each SLE station; a parking capacity goal that was established by the State to meet future SLE ridership projections.

At the proposed new Branford SLE Station (which was designed in May 2001), the July 2001 Parking Feasibility Study considered viable options for additional parking to supplement the 201-space surface lot already included as part of the new station design. The additional parking capacity would enable CTDOT to attain their 500-space goal. Options considered included 5.38 acres of vacant undeveloped land to the west of the new 201-space parking lot, a 1.96 acre triangular parcel to the east of Maple Street that would ultimately become available upon completion of a Town of Branford project to realign Maple Street, a 0.65 acre residential parcel to the north of the tracks and west of Kirkham Street, and the former 1.17 acre SLE parking lot located north of the tracks and accessed from Meadow Street. The northwestern quadrant was excluded from consideration due to a large tidal wetland located between the railroad tracks and Elm Street to the north.

The parking feasibility study concluded that it was not cost effective to develop parking on the 0.65 acre residential parcel to the north of the tracks and west of Kirkham Street as the parcel was too small and could only accommodate a maximum of 20 spaces. With respect to the 1.96 acre triangular parcel located east of Maple Street, it was determined that it was also too small to accommodate enough parking and that parking on this parcel would pose a safety concern as patrons would have to cross Maple Street at-grade to access the station. The remaining two parcels, the 5.38 acre vacant parcel and the former 1.17 acre commuter parking lot were determined to be the best options for parking as together they offered more than 360 spaces at a relatively low cost. Based on this logic, these two parcels were incorporated into the Proposed Action to satisfy the parking need.

The kiss-and-ride drop off area evolved later in the project development process. It was determined by CTDOT that the 0.65 acre residential parcel located immediately north of the tracks would need to be acquired to stage construction of the north-side high level rail platform. CTDOT opted to convert the parcel into a much needed kiss-and-ride drop off area upon completion of platform construction and this is how it became part of the Proposed Action.

No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, current operations at the Branford SLE Railroad Station in Branford would continue unchanged. Trains would continue to operate on one track (the south side) in order to pick-up and drop-off passengers. Although this is in keeping with current lease agreements between CTDOT and Amtrak regarding the existing SLE service, this type of operation will not be allowed once the lease agreement expires or when SLE service is expanded. The lease specifically requires that north-side high level rail platforms be constructed if CTDOT expects to expand SLE service beyond the current rush hour period in the future.
The No-Action Alternative also means that maximum parking capacity at the station will remain at 201-spaces and that no new parking will be constructed. A weekday peak hour parking survey conducted by Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc. (FHI) in May 2007 determined that parking at the Branford SLE Railroad Station is already at 100% capacity. Thus, under the No-Action Alternative, the existing parking shortage at the station will not be alleviated. Although the No-Action Alternative would involve no new construction and as a result, no significant environmental impacts, the alternative falls short of meeting the purpose and need of the project.

**Alternative Sites Controlled or Reasonably Available**

Because rail is a fixed system, land available for the Proposed Action must be located immediately adjacent to the rail corridor and existing station in order to gain maximum benefit from the project and its intended use. As described above under the Build Alternative, the north-side high level rail platform must be located opposite the existing south-side platform in order for optimal functionality, and parking expansion options are limited to only those parcels within a short and safe walking distance of the station. Lastly, the Proposed Action site is highly suitable because it is vacant, relatively flat, is easily accessible from local roadways, and is in close proximity to downtown Branford.

Overall, no other sites were evaluated since there are no other known available sites suitable for the Proposed Action.

**Impact Analysis Summary**

The implementation of the Proposed Action will have minor adverse environmental impacts that can be mitigated. Environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures are summarized in Table ES-1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Zoning</td>
<td>Acquisition of two privately owned parcels, one vacant and one with an unoccupied residence. No impacts to land use or zoning</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Local and Regional plans</td>
<td>The Proposed Action is consistent with local and regional development plans</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with C&amp;D Plan</td>
<td>The Proposed Action is consistent with the C&amp;D Plan</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Parking</td>
<td>The surrounding roadway network will adequately support the additional traffic volume generated by the Proposed Action. No adverse impacts anticipated. Beneficial impact as Proposed Action provides more parking for rail commuters and improved/safe pedestrian connections.</td>
<td>No mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Construction period impacts: Potential impacts from prolonged use of diesel powered vehicles. Typical diesel air quality emissions include carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxides, and particulate matter (PM2.5).</td>
<td>Construction equipment will be required to comply with all pertinent state and federal air quality regulations. Construction period BMPs to be followed to reduce airborne dust, other particulate matter, and odorous substances arising from project operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Construction period impacts: Potential for continuous as well as intermittent (or impulse) noise to be experienced in the immediate project vicinity.</td>
<td>Construction noise is exempt under Section 22a-69-1.8(g) of the RCSA, however, CTDOT’s general provision on construction noise described under Section 1.10.05 of Form 816 must be included in the construction contract for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods and Housing</td>
<td>Indirect beneficial impact to local socio-economic conditions as commuters may shop locally for convenience goods. No adverse impacts on neighborhoods or housing.</td>
<td>No mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Impact Analysis</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Creation of 2.88 acres (125,450 SF) of new paved surface contributes to increased site runoff and potential for increased sedimentation and contamination of downstream tidal wetlands and watercourses. Freshwater inputs to tidal systems during storm events and thermal pollution are also concerns. Construction period impacts: Increased potential for sedimentation of offsite streams and tidal wetlands due to runoff from exposed surfaces during site work.</td>
<td>Final design of new facility will be fully coordinated with the CTDEP and ACOE and will include primary and secondary stormwater renovation measures including a stormwater detention/retention pond with a forebay designed to collect and retain the first one (1) inch of stormwater runoff and effectively remove suspended sediments (Refer to progress design drawings 310-0047 C-106 and C-303 in Appendix A). Project design will comply with both the CTDEP 2004 Stormwater Quality Manual and the CTDEP 2002 Sedimentation and Erosion Control Manual. During construction, temporary best management practices (BMPs) will be employed and an erosion and sedimentation control plan (E&amp;S Plan) will be implemented. A stormwater pollution control plan (SWPCP) will also be registered for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Floodplains</td>
<td>Construction will involve the placement of fill into the 100-year coastal floodplain.</td>
<td>Some flood storage capacity will be replaced by the stormwater management system. Coordination will occur with CTDEP and ACOE on required permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>Impacts below the high tide line will be confined to the location where an existing undersized and partially constricted 12-inch RCP culvert will be replaced with either an open bottom span or arch culvert. A total of approximately 0.02 acres (720 SF) will be impacted due to work below the high tide line.</td>
<td>The new open bottom span or arch culvert will improve tidal flow/exchange, potentially improving the overall quality of and increasing the physical limits of tidal wetlands located upstream. Impacts below the high tide line and mitigation will be fully coordinated with the CTDEP and ACOE to ensure that proper mitigation is implemented for the Proposed Action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora, Fauna, Threatened and Endangered Species</td>
<td>Negligible adverse direct and indirect impacts to low value habitat.</td>
<td>No mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils and Geology</td>
<td>No Impacts</td>
<td>No mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Impact Analysis</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone and Coastal Barriers</td>
<td>The Proposed Action involves work below the high tide line and impacts to coastal floodplains. A total of approximately 0.02 acres (720 SF) will be impacted due to work below the high tide line. This impact will be confined to the location where an existing undersized and partially constricted 12-inch RCP culvert will be replaced by a new arch culvert or span with an open bottom. Construction of new parking lot and a portion of the kiss-and-ride drop off area will require placement of fill in the coastal floodplain.</td>
<td>The new open bottom span or arch culvert will improve tidal flow/exchange, potentially improving the overall quality of and increasing the physical limits of tidal wetlands located upstream. Impacts below the high tide line and mitigation will be fully coordinated with the CTDEP and ACOE to ensure that proper mitigation is implemented for the Proposed Action. Some flood storage capacity will be replaced by the stormwater management system. Coordination will occur with CTDEP and ACOE on required permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>No Impacts</td>
<td>No mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>There may be some potential for exposure of construction workers to low levels of hazardous materials and contamination that exist on the 5.38 acre vacant parcel slated for the new surface parking lot.</td>
<td>Although there is no enforcement action or a mandated remediation (such as a significant environmental hazard) for the site, CTDOT will prepare appropriate plans and specifications to address on-site contamination issues. These will include material handling and disposal requirements and health and safety measures to be undertaken during construction. As part of this, CTDOT will also be registering under the CTDEP “General Permit for Contaminated Soil and/or Sediment Management (Staging and Transfer)”. A Pre-Demolition Investigative Survey for Hazardous Building Materials (including lead, asbestos, and other identified hazardous and CT-regulated materials, wastes, and other items) has been conducted for the two-story residential building located at 14 Kirkham Street. As a result of this survey, CTDOT has prepared specifications to address all demolition issues associated with this property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use/Creation of Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>No Impacts</td>
<td>No mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics and Visual Effects</td>
<td>Southerly views from homes located along the south side of Elm Street and along Kirkham Street will be impacted.</td>
<td>A landscaping plan that includes vegetative buffers could minimize anticipated visual impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Uses and Conservation</td>
<td>Minimal increase in the amount of energy consumed above existing conditions.</td>
<td>No mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities and Services</td>
<td>Potential temporary service disruptions (CL&amp;P) during construction</td>
<td>Coordinate utility construction scheduling with service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Impact Analysis</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health and Safety</td>
<td>Beneficial Impact – site conditions improved (see hazardous materials and contamination discussion) and new safety features such as fencing and illumination added.</td>
<td>No mitigation required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**List of Potential Permits and Approvals**

The following permits, approvals, certifications, and registrations may be required for completion of the Proposed Action:

**Federal**

- ACOE Section 404 Permit

**State**

- CTDEP General Permit: Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters from Construction
- CTDEP General Permit for Contaminated Soil and/or Sediment Management (Staging and Transfer)
- CTDEP Flood Management Certification
- CTDEP 401 Water Quality Certification
- CTDEP Office of Long Island Sound Programs Structures, Dredging and Fill Permit
- CTDEP Office of Long Island Sound Programs Tidal Wetlands Permit

**Coordination Process**

Per CEPA requirements, a scoping notice for the Proposed Action was placed in Connecticut’s *Environmental Monitor* on June 5, 2007. A Public Scoping Meeting was not conducted for this project as such a meeting was not requested by 25 or more individuals or by an association that represents 25 or more members during the 30 day scoping comment period. Only three resource agencies, the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (CTDEP), the Connecticut Commission on Culture and Tourism – Historic Preservation and Museum Division, and the Connecticut Department of Public Health (CTDPH) provided scoping comments during the 30 day comment period. During data collection efforts involved in the documentation of existing environmental conditions, several federal and state resource agencies were contacted for information as were local officials in the Town of Branford. A copy of the CEPA public scoping notice as well as responses received during the formal public scoping period (June 5, 2007 through July 19, 2007) are included in Appendix B. Important agency and local correspondence is also included in Appendix B.
Conclusion
The Proposed Action is essential for increasing the efficiency of operations at the SLE Railroad Station in Branford and is an important part of meeting future transportation demands in southeastern Connecticut. Potential adverse effects from the Proposed Action include:

- Minor visual impacts to adjacent land uses located north of the railroad tracks along Elm Street and Kirkham Street;
- Loss of 5.38 acres of vacant undeveloped land that is currently under private ownership and which is designated as a coastal flood hazard area (100-year coastal floodplain). Some fill will be placed in the 100-year coastal floodplain that will result locally in a minor loss of flood storage capacity;
- Acquisition of a 0.65-acre private residential parcel that is partially within the coastal flood hazard area;
- Approximately 0.02 acres (720 SF) will be impacted below the high tide line during the replacement of an existing undersized and partially clogged 12-inch RCP culvert with a new open bottom span or arch culvert. The new open bottom span or arch culvert will improve tidal exchange in adjacent tidal wetlands to the north;
- Introduction of 2.88 acres (125,450 SF) of new paved surface which has the potential to affect water quality;
- Construction-period impacts relative to noise, air quality, energy usage, and stormwater among others, and;
- Potential for exposure of construction workers to subsurface contamination that exists on the 5.38 acre parcel that will be developed as a new 316-space surface parking lot.

These impacts will be mitigated through landscaping, proper management of materials and resources during and after construction, and by adhering to all applicable state, and federal regulations related to coastal resource protection, floodplain management, erosion and sedimentation control, and stormwater runoff/water quality treatment/management. CTDOT will also develop plans and specifications to address any on-site contamination issues. These plans will include material handling and disposal requirements. A Health and Safety Plan will also be developed and implemented in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) guidelines to ensure that construction workers are protected from potential contamination and other hazards.

Coordination with resource agencies, including the CTDEP and ACOE, among others, will continue throughout the duration of the project to ensure that all regulatory requirements are met. Through its impact avoidance and mitigation measures, the Proposed Action will not incur any significant environmental, cultural, or social impacts.
Review Period and Comments

The Draft EIE was made available for public review and comment from July 8, 2008 to August 21, 2008. Notice of Draft EIE availability and public hearing was placed in Connecticut’s Environmental Monitor on July 8, 2008. Additionally, notice of Draft EIE availability and public hearing was advertised in the New Haven Register on July 8, July 22, and August 5, 2008. Notices and Affidavits are included in Appendix E of this EIE. The Draft EIE was made available for public review at the following locations:

- Connecticut Department of Transportation Offices in Newington, Connecticut
- Branford Town Clerk’s Office
- James Blackstone Memorial Library in Branford, Connecticut
- South Central Regional Council of Governments Office in North Haven, Connecticut

A public hearing was advertised and held at the James Blackstone Memorial Library in Branford at 7:00 PM on August 7, 2008. A transcript of the public hearing is included in Appendix G. Written comments received during the public comment period (July 8, 2008 through August 21, 2008) are included in Appendix H. Responses to these comments, as well as comments made during the public hearing are provided in Appendix I.

Agency Contact

Department of Transportation
Mr. Edgar T. Hurle, Transportation Planning Director
Bureau of Policy and Planning
2800 Berlin Turnpike
P.O. Box 317546
Newington, CT 06131-7546
Phone: (860) 594-2005
Fax: (860) 594-3377
E-Mail: edgar.hurle@po.state.ct.us
**EIE Distribution List**

The following agencies/persons received a copy of the Draft Environmental Impact Evaluation for the Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station, Branford, Connecticut (State Project Nos. 310-0047 and 310-0048):

### State Representatives and Senators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Office Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Peter Panaroni</td>
<td>State Representative</td>
<td>Legislative Office Building, Room 4017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford, CT 06106-1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Edward Meyer</td>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>Legislative Office Building, Room 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford, CT 06106-1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Patricia M. Widlitz</td>
<td>State Representative</td>
<td>Legislative Office Building, Room 4034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford, CT 06106-1591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Town Officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Office Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Anthony “Unk” DaRos,</td>
<td>First Selectman</td>
<td>Town of Branford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Branford</td>
<td></td>
<td>1019 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Janice Plaziak, Town</td>
<td>Town Engineer</td>
<td>Town of Branford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1019 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Marianne Kelly, Town</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>Town of Branford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1019 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Shirley Rasmussen, Dir.</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>Town of Branford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td></td>
<td>1019 Main Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Office Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Gina McCarthy</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Department of Environmental Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td>79 Elm Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford, CT 06106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kendall Wiggin</td>
<td>State Librarian</td>
<td>Connecticut State Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>231 Capitol Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford, CT 06106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Fox</td>
<td>Senior Environmental Analyst</td>
<td>Department of Environmental Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td>79 Elm Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford, CT 06102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Robert M. Ward</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Motor Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 State Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wethersfield, CT 06161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Joan McDonald</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Economic and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Department of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>505 Hudson Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford, CT 06106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert L. Genuario</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Office of Policy and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450 Capitol Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford, CT 06106-1308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Raymond Jordan</td>
<td>State Coordinator</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Housing and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Department of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>One Corporate Center, 19th Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, CT 06103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Raeanne V. Curtis</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>165 Capitol Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford, CT 06106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hon. J. Robert Galvin, M.D., M.P.H.  
Commissioner  
Department of Public Health  
410 Capitol Avenue  
Hartford, CT 06134 | Mr. Judd Everhart  
Department of Transportation  
Office of Communications  
P.O. Box 317546  
2800 Berlin Turnpike  
Newington, CT 06131-7546 |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mr. Karl J. Wagener  
Executive Director  
Council on Environmental Quality  
79 Elm Street  
Hartford, CT 06106 | Ms. Karen Senich  
Executive Director  
Connecticut Commission on Culture and Tourism  
One Financial Plaza  
755 Main Street  
Hartford, CT 06103 |
| **Other**             |                                                               |
| Ms. Judy Gott  
Director  
South Central Regional Council of Governments  
127 Washington Avenue, 4th Floor West  
North Haven, CT 06473 | Ms. Kathy Rieger, Library Director  
James Blackstone Memorial Library  
758 Main Street  
Branford, CT 06405 |
APPENDIX B

*Environmental Monitor* EIE Public Scoping Notice, Comments Received, and Correspondence/Coordination
Scoping Notices

1. NEW! Waterbury Transportation Center (Waterbury)
2. NEW! Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station (Branford)
3. NEW! Madison Shore Line East Railroad Station (Madison)

Environmental Impact Evaluations available for review and comment

1. NEW! Metropolitan District Long Term Combined Sewer Overflow Control Project (Primarily Hartford, West Hartford)
2. Implementation of Master Plan Activities, East Haven Rifle Range (East Haven)
3. South Windsor I-291 Gateway Zone (South Windsor)

The next issue will be published on June 19, 2007. Subscribe to e-alerts to receive an e-mail when The Environmental Monitor is published.

Scoping Notices

Scoping Notices have been issued for the following state projects. These projects are in the earliest stages of planning. At the scoping stage, detailed information on a project's design, alternatives, and environmental impacts does not yet exist. Sponsoring agencies are asking for comments from other agencies and from the public as to the scope of alternatives and environmental impacts that should be considered for further study. Send your comments to the contact person listed for the project by the date indicated.
2. Notice of Scoping for Improvements to the Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station

**Municipality where project is located**: Branford

**Address of Project Location**: Meadow Street and Kirkham Street, Branford, CT

**Project Description**: Improvements include the construction of a 250 space surface parking lot on a parcel of land adjacent to the existing railroad station. Other improvements include the construction of a new north-side high level rail platform, reopening of the original resurfaced 70 space parking lot and construction of approximately 20 surface parking spaces on the north side of the tracks. This project will provide a total of 340 parking spaces.

**Project Map**: [Click here to view map #1](#) [Click here to view map # 2](#)

**Written comments from the public are welcome and will be accepted from June 5, 2007 until the close of business on July 19, 2007.**

Any person can ask the sponsoring agency to hold a Public Scoping Meeting by sending such a request to the address below. If a meeting is requested by 25 or more individuals, or by an association that represents 25 or more members, the sponsoring agency shall schedule a Public Scoping Meeting.

**Written comments and/or requests for a Public Scoping Meeting should be sent to:**

**Name**: Mr. Edgar T. Hurle - Transportation Planning Director  
**Agency**: State of Connecticut Department of Transportation  
**Address**: 2800 Berlin Turnpike  
Newington, CT 06131  
**Fax**: 860-594-3377  
**E-Mail**: Edgar.Hurle@po.state.ct.us

**If you have questions about the public meeting, or other questions about the scoping for this project, contact:**

**Name**: Ms. Jessica DiLuca - Transportation Planner II  
**Agency**: State of Connecticut Department of Transportation

**Address**: 2800 Berlin Turnpike  
Newington, CT 06131
The agency expects to release a Draft Environmental Impact Evaluation for this project, for public review and comment, in October, 2007
March 14, 2006

Mr. Scott A. Hill
Bureau of Engineering & Highway Operations
ConnDOT
2800 Berlin Turnpike
Newington, CT

Subject: Supplemental Rail Parking
          Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station
          Branford, CT
          ConnDOT #310-xxx

Dear Mr. Hill:

The State Historic Preservation Office has reviewed the above-named project. This office expects that the proposed undertaking will have no effect on historic, architectural, or archaeological resources listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

This office appreciates the opportunity to have reviewed and commented upon the proposed undertaking.

This comment is provided in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act and the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act.

For further information please contact Dr. David A. Poirier, Staff Archaeologist.

Sincerely,

J. Paul Loether
Division Director and Deputy
State Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Mr. Keith Hall/ConnDOT
June 20, 2007

Ms. Cynthia S. Holden  
Environmental Planning  
ConnDOT  
2800 Berlin Turnpike  
Newington, CT

Subject: Branford Shore Island East Railroad Station Improvements  
Meadow Street and Kirkham Street  
Branford, CT  
ConnDOT #310-xxx

Dear Ms. Holden:

The State Historic Preservation Office has reviewed the above-named project. This office expects that the proposed undertaking will have no effect on historic, architectural, or archaeological resources listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

This office appreciates the opportunity to have reviewed and commented upon the proposed undertaking.

This comment is provided in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act and the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act.

For further information, please contact Dr. David A. Poirier, Staff Archaeologist.

Sincerely,

Karen Senich  
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
June 6, 2007

Mr. Edgar T Hurle, Transportation Planning Director
Department of Transportation
2800 Berlin Turnpike
Newington, CT 06106

RE: Notice of Scoping for Improvements to the Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station

Dear Mr. Hurle:

The Drinking Water Section of the Department of Public Health has reviewed the above-mentioned project for potential impacts to any sources of public drinking water supply. This project does not appear to be in a public water supply source water area, therefore the Drinking Water Section has no comments at this time.

Sincerely,

Lori Mathieu, Supervising Environmental Analyst
Source Water Protection Unit
Drinking Water Section

FROM THE DESK OF CYNTHIA S. HOLDEN

JUN 07 2007
STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

July 17, 2007

Mr. Edgar T. Hurle, Transportation Planning Director
Connecticut Department of Transportation
2800 Berlin Turnpike
Newington, CT 06131-7546

Re: Review of Scoping Notice for Improvements to the Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station

Dear Mr. Hurle:

The following comments are offered in response to your request concerning the improvements to the Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station located at Meadow Street and Kirkham Street, Branford, CT. A review of the Scoping Description indicated that improvements would consist of construction of a 250 space surface parking lot on a parcel of land adjacent to the existing railroad station.

The following summarizes the Department's position with regard to lead and asbestos issues:

A. Lead-Based Paint:
Many demolition, rehabilitation, or renovation activities that are associated with these types of projects are not subject to the Department of Public Health (DPH), Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention and Control (LPPC) Regulations (§§19a-111-1 through 19a-111-11). Should the scope of the project change from demolition to renovation/rehabilitation and if children under six (6) years of age live in any residences that will be undergoing renovation/rehabilitation where testing of paint reveals toxic levels of lead, then compliance with applicable CT Department of Public Health regulations on lead abatement must be achieved.

Please be aware that many renovation projects that involve residential properties and utilize U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding, are significantly affected by recently enacted federal rules (24 CFR Part 35, et al.) regarding the use of lead-safe work practices. These revised federal requirements took effect on September 15, 2000. Many HUD funded renovation projects may proceed with the use of lead-safe work practices that are implemented by workers (renovators and painters) who have been trained in lead-safe work techniques. However, some HUD funded renovation projects would trigger the LPPC regulations and require the use of appropriate lead abatement protocol and trained, state certified lead abatement personnel. Determination in this regard is dependant upon site specific circumstances such as; (1) occupancy status regarding children under six years of age, (2) paint testing obligations per the HUD regulations, and (3) the amount of federal funding that is dedicated to a project.

FROM THE DESK OF
CYNTHIA S. HOLDEN

JUL 26 2007

Phone:
Telephone Device for the Deaf: (860) 509-7191
410 Capitol Avenue - MS #
P.O. Box 340308 Hartford, CT 06134
Affirmative Action / An Equal Opportunity Employer
In addition there are other issues that must be addressed related to lead-based paint. Among these issues are the following:

- Any testing of paint on existing structures must be performed by a lead inspector or lead inspector/risk assessor certified by the DPH.
- Planned rehabilitation, renovation, or demolition activities should be performed using lead-safe work practices.
- Additionally, if lead-based paint or lead containing paint is identified, workers must be trained (as a minimum) according to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) lead standard (29 CFR 1926.62). Because other contaminants may also be present on the site, additional health and safety training may be required (e.g., hazardous waste and/or asbestos).
- If lead-based paint or lead containing paint is identified on any of the structures, the classification and disposal of generated waste must comply with the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) and Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection standards (e.g., Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure [TCLP] testing, and reporting and record keeping requirements by the contractor).

Additional inquiries on the subject of lead-based paint can be directed to Alan Buzzetti, Supervising Environmental Sanitarian, Lead Environmental Management Unit at (860) 509-7299.

B. Asbestos Program:
This facility is subject to the provisions of 40 CFR 61, Subpart M, the asbestos national Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants. As such, a thorough inspection of the facility must be conducted prior to commencement of any renovation or demolition activities. A DPH licensed asbestos inspector or Management Planner is required to conduct this asbestos inspection. In the event that asbestos-containing material is identified that will be impacted by the renovation or demolition activities, the material must be properly abated. A DPH licensed asbestos abatement contractor must conduct any asbestos abatement that involves more than three (3) linear feet or more than three square feet of asbestos-containing material. Additionally, the DPH must provide with notification prior to asbestos abatement that involves greater than 10 linear feet or greater than 25 square feet. Asbestos abatement must be performed in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

Additional inquiries on the subject of asbestos abatement can be directed to Ronald Skomro, Supervising Environmental Sanitarian, Coordinator of the Asbestos Program at 860-509-7367.

Please contact Ron Skomro, Supervising Environmental Sanitarian, Asbestos Program at (860) 509-7367.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Suzanne Blancafior, MS, Chief
Environmental Health Section

C: J. Smith, Office of Policy Management
Mr. Edgar T. Hurle, Transportation Planning Director  
Connecticut Department of Transportation  
Bureau of Policy and Planning  
2800 Berlin Turnpike  
Post Office Box 317546  
Newington, Connecticut 06131-7546

Re: Scoping Notice – Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station

Dear Ned:

These comments are provided in response to the Notice of Scoping published in the Environmental Monitor for the improvements to the Branford station of Shore Line East. DEP supports efforts to expand the capacity of public transportation services such as Shore Line East, and in this specific case its potential to reduce vehicle miles of travel and congestion on Interstate 95.

DEP also notes that the expansion and upgrade of Shore Line East services and facilities is endorsed in the South Central Regional Long Range Transportation Plan 2007 – 2035. That Plan also advocates that provision be made for bicycles at Shore Line East facilities. DEP endorses the call for bicycle racks at Shore Line East stations to encourage multi-modal trips involving bicycles and mass transit.

The proposed project includes that construction of a new 250 space parking lot west of the existing lot, construction of a northside high level platform, reopening of the original 70 space parking lot, and the addition of a 20 space lot on the north side of the tracks.

The site plan attached to the Notice of Scoping appears to show the footprint of the new parking area encroaching into the tidal creek separating the new and existing lots. Both from the standpoint of actual encroachment into a tidal creek or tidal wetland and the proximity of the new lot to the creek, DEP is concerned about potential adverse impacts to tidal wetlands and coastal water quality from stormwater runoff and direct filling, and we will be evaluating the plans to ensure such impacts are minimized. Even relatively clean runoff of fresh water into tidal wetlands or creeks can cause adverse impacts. Approaches such as maximizing stormwater infiltration may likely be encouraged to reduce heated runoff and freshwater discharges to tidal wetlands. In evaluating any design that incorporates stormwater infiltration, we would need soil boring and permeability data and require adequate pretreatment to ensure the long-term effectiveness of the system. It appears from the plans that some preliminary soil probing has been conducted.
The proposed project lies within the Connecticut Coastal Boundary as established by Connecticut General Statutes section 22a-94 and, therefore, any actions proposed by ConnDOT within the coastal boundary which may significantly affect the environment must be fully consistent with the policies and standards of the Connecticut Coastal Management Act. Because this is a State action, not subject to municipal review, ConnDOT will need to request a coastal consistency concurrence determination from the DEP Office of Long Island Sound Programs.

The site plan map attached to the Notice of Scoping is, because of its scale, not totally clear as to the presence and extent of tidal waters or tidal wetlands involvement in the new parking lot and the access to it. ConnDOT will need to apply to the DEP Office of Long Island Sound Programs (DEP-OLISP) for either a Structures, Dredging and Fill Permit, pursuant to sections 22a-359 through 22a-363f of the Connecticut General Statutes and/or a Tidal Wetlands Permit pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes sections 22a-28 through 22a-35. This project will be held to a standard of no new fill being placed in tidal wetlands or tidal waters. ConnDOT is encouraged to discuss this project with DEP-OLISP staff at its earliest convenience. That office can be contacted at (860) 424-4034. Opportunities to improve tidal circulation in the creek between the existing and proposed new parking lots should be explored.

It appears from the scoping notice site plan that the new lot will be approximately two acres in size. For stormwater discharges from construction sites where one or more acres are to be disturbed, a permit pursuant to 40 CFR 122.26 is required. The Permitting & Enforcement Division has issued a General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters Associated with Construction Activities that will cover these discharges. For projects disturbing five or more acres, registration describing the site and the construction activity must be submitted to the Department prior to the initiation of construction. A stormwater pollution control plan, including measures such as erosion and sediment controls and post construction stormwater management, must be prepared. For sites where more than 10 acres will be disturbed, the plan must be submitted to the Department. A goal of 80 percent removal of total suspended solids from the stormwater discharge shall be used in designing and installing stormwater management measures. Another requirement of this permit is that stormwater discharges located less than 500 feet from a tidal wetland must be discharged through a system designed to retain the volume of stormwater runoff generated by 1 inch of rainfall on the site. For construction projects with a total disturbed area between one and five acres, no registration is required as long as the project is reviewed by the town and receives written approval of its erosion and sediment control measures and it adheres to the Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control. If no review is conducted by the town or written approval is not provided, the permittee must register with the Department. For further information, contact the division at (860) 424-3018. A copy of the general permit as well as registration forms may be downloaded at:

ConnDOT has previously contacted the DEP Natural Diversity Data Base regarding this project and has received a reply dated February 27, 2007 stating that "According to our records, there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species at the site in question."
Our best wishes to ConnDOT as you proceed with the development of an Environmental Impact Evaluation for this project. We look forward to reviewing this document when it has been completed and released, and we wish you well with this project. If you should have any questions concerning these comments, please feel free to call me at (860) 424-4110.

Respectfully,

Frederick L. Riese
Senior Environmental Analyst

cc: John Gaucher, OLISP
Robert Kaliszewski
October 1, 2007

Mr. Michael J. Bartlett
New England Field Offices Supervisor
United States Fish & Wildlife Service
70 Commercial Street, Suite 300
Concord, NH 03301-5087

Subject: Shoreline East Expansion - Branford
Branford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Bartlett,

Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc. is presently under contract to prepare environmental impact documents and permits for the above referenced State of Connecticut project. A review of the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (CTDEP) State and Federal Listed Species and Significant Natural Communities GIS database dated May 2007 for the project study area indicates that there are locations of potential conflict with an endangered species and/or significant natural community.

To further support FHI's investigation into potential threatened and endangered species concerns and/or significant wildlife habitats, FHI requests that your office kindly forward us any federal threatened and endangered species information related to this project study area. A map depicting the project study area and CTDEP State and Federal Listed Species and Significant Natural Communities data is enclosed. We look forward to receiving any information you can provide us, and to future coordination with your office.

Very truly yours,

FITZGERALD & HALLIDAY, INC.

David Laiuppa
Planner II

Enclosure

Cc: J. DiLuca, P. Stanton (FHI), file P463.13
Reference: Project Location
Site assessment Branford, CT

David Laiuppa
Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.
72 Cedar St.
Hartford, CT 06106

Dear Mr. Laiuppa:

This responds to your recent correspondence requesting information on the presence of federally-listed and/or proposed endangered or threatened species in relation to the proposed activity(ies) referenced above.

Based on information currently available to us, no federally-listed or proposed, threatened or endangered species or critical habitat under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are known to occur in the project area(s). Preparation of a Biological Assessment or further consultation with us under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act is not required.

This concludes our review of listed species and critical habitat in the project location(s) and environs referenced above. No further Endangered Species Act coordination of this type is necessary for a period of one year from the date of this letter, unless additional information on listed or proposed species becomes available.

In order to curtail the need to contact this office in the future for updated lists of federally-listed or proposed threatened or endangered species and critical habitats, please visit the Endangered Species Consultation page on the New England Field Office’s website:

www.fws.gov/northeast/newenglandfieldoffice/EndangeredSpec-Consultation.htm

In addition, there is a link to procedures that may allow you to conclude if habitat for a listed species is present in the project area. If no habitat exists, then no federally-listed species are present in the project area and there is no need to contact us for further consultation. If the above conclusion cannot be reached, further consultation with this office is advised. Information describing the nature and location of the proposed activity that should be provided to us for further informal consultation can be found at the above-referenced site.
Thank you for your coordination. Please contact us at 603-223-2541 if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Anthony P. Tur
Endangered Species Specialist
New England Field Office
Instructions for Completing a Connecticut Natural Diversity Data Base Review Request Form

Introduction
Section 26-310 of the Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) provides that any activity authorized by a state agency, including any activity issued a permit by DEP, must not threaten the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species. If your activity is located in an area of concern, DEP’s Connecticut Natural Diversity Data Base (CT NDDB) program will conduct a detailed review to determine if there will be any impact from your project and you will be notified of their results.

How to Use the Maps
DEP has produced a set of maps entitled "State and Federal Listed Species and Natural Communities" (NDDB maps). These maps serve as a preliminary screening tool to assist in the evaluation of impacts to endangered and threatened species.

In order to determine whether your proposed activity may threaten the continued existence of an endangered or threatened species, you should review the NDDB maps. The maps are available in the DEP File Room at 79 Elm Street, Hartford, as well as with each town planner. NDDB printed maps and GIS data are also available for purchase from the DEP Store.

The maps are based on USGS quadrangle maps and cover the entire State of Connecticut. To use the maps, locate the project boundaries and any additional impacted areas on the appropriate map(s). If you are not sure on which quadrangle the project is located, use the quadrangle index map to identify the appropriate quadrangle(s).

No Conflict
If the project is not

- within a shaded area; or
- overlapping a water body that has any shading; or
- upstream or downstream (by less than ½ mile) from a shaded area

then the project will not impact any known occurrence of listed species or significant natural community. If you are applying for a DEP permit, indicate, in the site information section of the relevant permit application form, that the maps were reviewed and list the date of the map (located in the map legend). You do not need to complete and submit the CT NDDB Review Request Form (DEP-APP-007).

Potential Conflict
If any part of the project is

- within a shaded area; or
- overlapping a water body that has any shading; or
- upstream or downstream (by less than ½ mile) from a shaded area

then the project may have a conflict with a species or natural community.

In the case of a potential conflict, a completed CT NDDB Review Request Form (DEP-APP-007) with a project description and a copy of a map (a 1:24,000 USGS quadrangle map) clearly showing the project boundaries must be submitted to the NDDB program at the address specified on the form. If a field survey of the project area has been previously conducted to identify any presence of endangered, threatened or special concern species, indicate, on the CT NDDB Request Form, the biologist's name who conducted the field survey, his or her address, and include a copy of the field survey, with the completed CT NDDB Request Form.

NDDB staff will perform a more detailed review of projects identified as having potential conflicts. (Note: NDDB review generally takes four to six weeks.) Depending on the nature and scope of the proposed project, you may be required to obtain additional on-site surveys.
NDDB will return a “no conflict” response if listed species or significant natural communities will not be impacted based on the scope of the project activities and project location. This “no conflict” response can be submitted with the permit application form or forwarded to the DEP permit analyst working on your project.

If the project potentially impacts listed species or significant natural communities, the appropriate DEP division will provide recommendations to avoid endangered and threatened species or recommendations to minimize impacts to species of special concern and significant natural communities. The comments will vary depending on the scope of the proposed project or activity and the extent of the information available on the species or community to be impacted.

DEP responsibility for listed species and natural communities is as follows: the NDDB is responsible for plants and natural communities; the Wildlife Division is responsible for vertebrate and invertebrate animals (except fish); and the Fisheries Division is responsible for the listed fish species. The permit analyst will incorporate this information into any permits issued by the department.

DEP’s Permit Application Management System will verify the information submitted as part of the permit application process. Projects with a long planning stage should be reviewed annually as the information on the maps does change as information is added and updated by the NDDB program.

For information other than for site specific projects or if you have any questions, contact the NDDB at 860-424-3540.
Connecticut Natural Diversity Data Base
Review Request Form

Please complete this form only if you have conducted a review which determined that your activity is located in an area of concern.

Name: David Laiuppa
Affiliation: Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.
Mailing Address: 72 Cedar Street
City/Town: Hartford  State: CT  Zip Code: 06106
Business Phone: 8602432456  ext.  Fax: 8607606225
Contact Person: David Laiuppa
Project or Site Name: Shoreline East Expansion - Branford

Brief Description of Proposed Activities:
General construction/expansion of a commuter parking lot for rail station.

Have you conducted a “State and Federal Listed Species and Natural Communities Map” review?
☐ Yes  ☒ No  Date of Map:

Has a field survey been previously conducted to determine the presence of any endangered, threatened or special concern species?
☐ Yes  ☒ No

If yes, provide the following information and submit a copy of the field survey with this form.

Biologists Name:
Address:

If the project will require a permit, list type of permit, agency and date or proposed date of application:

(See reverse side - you must sign the certification on the reverse side of this form)
The Connecticut Natural Diversity Data Base (CT NDDB) information will be used for:

☑ environmental assessment (give reasons for assessment):
  
  State project # 310-0019.

☐ other (specify):

“I certify that the information supplied on this form is complete and accurate, and that any material supplied by the CT NDDB will not be published without prior permission.”

10/01/07
Signature

Date

All requests must include a USGS topographic map with the project boundary clearly delineated.

Return completed form to:

NATURAL DIVERSITY DATA BASE/DATA REQUEST
ENVIRONMENTAL & GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION CENTER
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
79 ELM STREET, STORE LEVEL
HARTFORD, CT 06106-5127

* You must submit a copy of this completed form with your registration or permit application.
October 25, 2007

David Laiuppa
Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.
72 Cedar Street
Hartford, CT 06106

Re: Shoreline East Expansion, Branford

Dear Mr. Laiuppa:

I have reviewed Natural Diversity Data Base maps and files regarding the area delineated on the map you provided and listed above. According to our information, there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species at the site in question.

Natural Diversity Data Base information includes all information regarding critical biologic resources available to us at the time of the request. This information is a compilation of data collected over the years by the Environmental and Geographic Information Center’s Geological and Natural History Survey and cooperating units of DEP, private conservation groups and the scientific community. This information is not necessarily the result of comprehensive or site-specific field investigations. Consultations with the Data Base should not be substituted for on-site surveys required for environmental assessments. Current research projects and new contributors continue to identify additional populations of species and locations of habitats of concern, as well as, enhance existing data. Such new information is incorporated into the Data Base as it becomes available.

Please contact me if you have further questions regarding this information (424-3585). Thank you for consulting the Natural Diversity Data Base. Also be advised that this is a preliminary review and not a final determination. A more detailed review may be conducted as part of any subsequent environmental permit applications submitted to DEP for the proposed site.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Nancy Murray
Biologist/Senior Environmental Analyst NDDB
Program Coordinator

NM/blm
APPENDIX C

*Environmental Monitor* Draft EIE Availability Notice, Legal Notices of Availability, and Affidavits
Scoping Notices
1. Danbury Branch Rail Line Alternatives Analysis, Fairfield and Litchfield Counties

Environmental Impact Evaluations
1. **NEW!** Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station
2. Improvements to the New Haven Rail Yard Maintenance Facility

State Land Transfers
There are no state land transfers posted for public notice or comment in this edition.

The next issue will be published on July 22, 2008.

**Subscribe to e-alerts** to receive an e-mail when The Environmental Monitor is published.

---

**EIE Notices**

The following Environmental Impact Evaluations (EIEs) have been completed by state agencies and are available for review and comment.

---

**1. Notice of EIE for the Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station**

**Municipality where project is proposed:** Branford, CT

**Address of Possible Project Location:** 39 Maple Street Branford, CT
**Project Description:** Infrastructure improvements to the Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station including a new north-side high level rail platform, a new pedestrian bridge over the active rail line connecting the north-side and south-side platforms and new, expanded surface parking.

**Project Map:**  [Click here to view a schematic of the station site plan.](#)  
[Click here to view a schematic of the parking facility.](#)

**Comments on this EIE will be accepted until the close of business on:**  
**August 21, 2008**

**The public can view a copy of this EIE at:** The Branford Town Clerk's Office - 1019 Main Street Branford, CT 06405, The James Blackstone Memorial Library - 758 Main Street Branford, CT, 06405, The Connecticut Department of Transportation - 2800 Berlin Turnpike, Room 2155, Newington, CT 06131, The South Central Regional Council of Governments - 127 Washington Avenue, 4th floor west, North Haven, CT 06473-1715.

**There is a public hearing scheduled for this EIE on:**

**DATE:** Thursday August 7, 2008  
**TIME:** 7:00 pm  
**PLACE:** James Blackstone Memorial Library Auditorium

**Send your comments about this EIE to:**

**Name:** Edgar Hurle - Transportation Planning Director  
**Agency:** State of Connecticut Department of Transportation  
**Address:** 2800 Berlin Turnpike, Newington, CT 06131  
**E-Mail:** Edgar.Hurle@po.state.ct.us

**If you have questions about the public hearing, where you can review this EIE, or similar matters, please contact :**

**Name:** Jessica DiLuca - Transportation Planner II  
**Agency:** State of Connecticut Department of Transportation  
**Address:** 2800 Berlin Turnpike, Newington, CT 06131  
**E-Mail:** Jessica.DiLuca@po.state.ct.us  
**Phone:** 860-594-2135
Affidavit of Publication

State of Connecticut
County of Fairfield

I, Arleen Rogers, a billing representative of Graystone Group Advertising, 2710 North Ave., Suite 200, Bridgeport, CT 06604, do solemnly swear that on:

Date: 7/8, 7/22 & 8/5/08

Ad title: LEGAL NOTICE

Appeared in: NEW HAVEN REGISTER publication and the newspaper attachment is from the above named issue of said newspaper.

Subscribed and sworn to this 28th day of August, 2007 before me.

KATHLEEN VITKO
NOTARY PUBLIC
State of Connecticut
My Commission Expires
July 31, 2012

[Signature]

Notary Public
APPENDIX D

Public Hearing Transcript
ROBERT W. IKE:  Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is Robert W. Ike from the Connecticut Department of Transportation. I will serve as the Moderator for tonight’s public hearing.

I’d like to introduce the individuals to my left and right who are here this evening to make presentations and listen to your comments and concerns -- Mr. Paul M. Stanton, Principal Planner, Fitzgerald & Halliday Inc, and Mr. Steve Degen from the Connecticut Department of Transportation’s Office of Rights of Way.

We also have DOT staff, Miss Kim Lesay, Mr. [tape cuts out] …of Planning, Mr. Eugene Colonese, our Rail Administrator, Mr. Scott Hill, our Principal Engineer. We have Mr. John Hanifin, Office of Rails, Mr. Keith A. Hall from Facilities and Mr. Richard Cassin, and David Tudryn from Baker Engineering. We have our technicians Mr. Carbonell and Mr. Hudson.

We are meeting with you this evening in order to discuss the current design plans and draft Connecticut Environmental Impact Evaluation for improvements to the Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station here in the
Town of Branford. This public hearing is being conducted in accordance with the Connecticut Department of Transportation’s policy entitled, “Public Involvement/Public Hearings for Highway Layouts and Designs”, revised October 1995.

The draft EIE document has been available for public inspection here at the James Blackstone Memorial Library, 758 Main Street, Branford, Branford Town Hall, Town Clerk’s Office, 1019 Main Street, Branford, South Central Regional Council of Governments, 127 Washington Avenue, 4th Floor, North Haven, as well as at the Connecticut Department of Transportation, 2800 Berlin Turnpike, Room 2155, Newington.

I will now discuss the format for tonight’s hearing; then I will turn the podium over to the presenters who will give design, environmental and Right of Way presentations of the draft EIE document. I will then moderate the hearing as we listen to your comments. For your information our presentation should take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete.

My intent is to conduct a fair and orderly hearing tonight by following a particular format. We would appreciate your patience during my remarks as well as the presentations to follow by holding your remarks and comments until this portion of the hearing has been completed. We will be
happy to remain here this evening until everyone has had a reasonable
opportunity to speak.

Experience has shown that audible recordings can only be made if the
person making a statement uses the microphone connected to the recording
equipment. A microphone has been set up -- if you wish to make a
statement please come to the microphone after I read your name from the
sign-up sheet. Please introduce yourself and if you are representing an
organization please give its name as well. If you didn’t sign up to speak but
a question comes to mind, feel free to raise your hand and I’ll be happy to
recognize you after I go through the speaker sign-up sheet.

For those individuals who have prepared a statement you may read it
into the record if you so desire. However, if the statement is lengthy, you
are asked to offer a written copy of the statement for the record and give a
brief summary its contents. Such attachments to the record carry as much
weight as the transcribed verbal testimony received here tonight when the
transcript is reviewed.

If you wish to speak this evening, we have a sign-up sheet at the
entrance to the room. There is a three minute time limit on all first time
speakers. There will be no yielding of your time to other speakers; your
time is for your own comments. If, after all first time speakers have
finished, anyone who would like the opportunity to speak again, a reasonable amount of additional time will be allotted for this purpose. Anyone who wishes to present written comments for the public hearing… record should give them to me before the end of tonight’s hearing.

As a result of the information that you might learn at tonight’s hearing you may wish to make additional comments on the draft EIE document. Written statements or exhibits concerning it may be mailed or delivered to the attention of:

Mr. Edgar T. Hurle
Transportation Planning Director
Office of Intermodal and Environmental Planning
Connecticut Department of Transportation
2800 Berlin Turnpike
Newington, CCT 06131-7546

This information is also available in the handout which you should have received when you entered the room tonight. The deadline for receipt of comments on this draft EIE document is August 21, 2008. Written statements or exhibits must be postmarked by this date and must be reproducible in black and white on not larger than 8 ½ x 11 inch paper. This
information will be made part of the public hearing record and will be considered in the same regard as oral statements.

At this point, I will turn the podium over to Mr. Stanton who will give environmental and design information on this proposed project. Mr. Stanton will be followed by Mr. Steve Degen who will give the Rights of Way presentation. Mr. Stanton…

PAUL STANTON: All right. Thanks Bob. Oh…it’s pretty loud. The purpose of this hearing as Bob mentioned is to provide an overview of the project and its design elements and to provide a summary of the environmental impact evaluation that we prepared for the project and lastly to hear your comments on the proposed action and the findings of the document. And we talked a little bit about the agenda. I’m going to give a presentation about the project design briefly and then talk about the environmental findings and then Mr. Steve Degen here will talk about the right of way presentation and then you’ll be given an opportunity to give your comments.

As far as the project is concerned, it’s taking place on the existing Branford Railroad Station site – the Shore Line East Station site and these two pictures show – oops, I’m sorry – these two pictures show what’s out there currently. This is the south side high level rail platform and passenger
covering area or whatever and then you have…this is the surface parking lots. There’s a 201-space surface parking lot there that’s located south of the tracks. And the station, as you can see, it’s quite new. It was designed and completed and open for service in August of 2005.

The proposed action that was evaluated in the environmental document included infrastructure improvements at that station site. There’s going to be a north side high level rail platform that’s going to be basically built on the north side of the tracks parallel to the south side platform. There’s going to be a pedestrian overpass with elevators that’s going to go up and over the tracks to allow for safe transfer between the two platforms. There’s going to be a new 316-space surface parking lot that’s going to be built to the south of the tracks and just to the west of the existing surface parking lot. And there’s going to be…they’re going to refurbish 52 parking spaces on a linear parcel that’s located between the north side of the tracks and Meadow Street and that used to serve the old railroad station and it’s going to provide 52 spaces of overflow parking.

And the last element of the project is a kiss-and-ride drop-off area that’s going to be located north of the tracks and it’s going to have a direct access to the new north side high level platform. The project cost is estimated to be $20 to $25 Million and that’s based on the mid-point of
construction which is 2010, and the construction schedule takes it from January 2010 to the spring…sometime in the spring of 2011. And as I mentioned the site is on the existing Shore Line East Railroad Station site and that’s bounded by Elm Street on the north, Harbor Street on the West, Curve Street on the South and Indian Neck Avenue and also Maple Street…the intersection on the east.

The project…the infrastructure improvements are going to occur on four parcels. There is a 5.38 acre parcel. That’s where the 316-space surface parking lot is going to be built on. It’s a vacant undeveloped parcel that’s located west, like I said, of the existing surface parking lot. There’s two parcels – a .32 acre parcel and a .27 acre parcel that combine to form a residential parcel that’s located to the north of the tracks. That’s where the kiss-and-ride facility is going to be located, and then this last 1.17 acre parcel again is the linear parcel that was former parking area for the older Branford Station.

Access to the station is going to be continued…continue to be gained from…where the intersection of Indian Neck Avenue and Maple Street are there is an access road that goes right into the existing 201-space parking lot and that’s where the main station access is going to be. The kiss-and-ride access is going to be north of the tracks on the west side of Kirkham Street.
I have a few graphics here I just want to go through. This is…it’s kind of hard to see the street names from way back but this black area is basically the study area that we considered for the Environmental Impact Evaluation and what I have highlighted in blue are the new station elements – the new infrastructure, the parking lot, there’s the north side platform and the pedestrian overpass and then this is the kiss-and-ride, and this I have highlighted in pink because it is an existing feature but it is…this is where the overflow parking is going to be located. And this pink area and some of the other features is the existing infrastructure with the surface parking lot and so forth.

Another angle – this is a Google earth shot and again, you can see this is the existing surface parking lot, Maple Street and Indian Neck Road. This is the northeast corridor railroad tracks where Shore Line East operates on and here’s your kiss-and-ride location; your platform that’s going to be opposite the existing platform and then your new parking area.

And I got a few more graphics just to really get this point home. This is just a site plan. Again, the brown is basically the footprint of the new parking lot. The yellow is the north side platform and then here is the pedestrian overpass with the elevators on either side. And all this…all these features are going to be interconnected with pedestrian walkways and
stairwells and things like that so it will be fully handicapped accessible and there’ll be easy access to each side of the station.

Here again is a footprint of the kiss-and-ride area and again, the north side platform and the pedestrian bridge. And again, I just wanted to show this was the overflow parking area.

David Tudryn and his group from Michael Baker Corporation, the design team that’s putting together the design for this project and they provided this nice rendering of what the station’s possibly going to look like, and you know, David will be here after this to answer any design questions you may have.

So why are we…why do we have to do an environmental impact evaluation? Um, there’s State funding involved with this project and whenever there’s a State funded public project, you have to comply with the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act or CEPA. It’s triggered. CEPA is the State version of the National Environmental Policy Act if you’re familiar with that. Because there’s no Federal funds involved with this, we don’t have to do a NEPA document but we do have to do a CEPA document, and the EIE document basically assessed potential impacts from the project and we look at ways to avoid those impacts. We first want to avoid resources to the greatest extent possible and where we can’t avoid them, we try to
minimize them; minimize impacts. And a good example of that would be if you have a fill-slope that might encroach upon a wetland; we’ll try out best to maybe build a retaining wall to keep that fill from going into the wetland area. So that’s a minimization feature. For adverse impacts that we can’t avoid, we have to come up with a mitigation strategy to offset those impacts. The most important thing about the CEPA process is it’s a transparent process. It allows the public opportunity to comment and that’s what we’re here for tonight. So I hope at the end of the meeting you can submit comments here or through…there’s some forms attached to the back of the handout and those can be sent in to Mr. Edgar Hurle.

This is just a slide to show the EIE process. It’s pretty straightforward and I don’t want to get into the details of it but I do want to point out that the red circles highlight where we are in the process. We’ve basically gone through project scoping. We’ve documented our existing conditions and we’ve come up and assessed our alternatives and our impacts and we’ve produced the draft EIE which Mr. Ike explained was let out to the public in, I think it was July 8th…yeah, July 8th…and the public comment period is closing on August 21st. Once we get your comments back, we’ll look at them all and incorporate the information into the final document and prepare what’s called a Record of Decision or ROD and the information will all be
delivered to the State Office of Policy and Management or OPM and they will determine the adequacy of the EIE’s information.

This slide shows essentially the resource topics that are covered in an EIE. They’re basically broken down into community-type resources, natural resources and then I call this other category; another category because it kind of catches a lot of different things. We look at traffic and parking and land use. We’ll look and see if a project has any undue impacts to a neighborhood or the cohesiveness of neighborhoods. Socio-economic conditions are considered as well as public safety. On the natural side of things we look at soils and geology. We’ll look at a project’s impact on the wildlife habitats and we’ll assess the habitat and the existing conditions but we’ll also look at threatened and endangered species or critical habitats to see if any exist in the study area. Water quality is a topic we cover. Wetlands – in this case, the project is in the tidal wetland area; ground water and floodplains. And then we also cover noise, air quality, cultural resources and so forth. We cover both beneficial as well as adverse impacts [sneezes – says excuse me] and again as I mentioned earlier, we…the process is basically to avoid, minimize and then mitigate impacts.

I have a couple more graphics here just to show some of the existing resources in the area and this red line just shows the Connecticut coastal
boundary, and you can see that everything to the southeast, all this area
down here – excuse me – is within the coastal zone. The green area is tidal
wetlands within the study area. This is ah, this shows coastal flood zone;
coastal flood plains; 100 year flood zone…and I didn’t want to put too many
graphics in here. I didn’t want to overwhelm you but… So what’s the
findings? Well I want to start out the benefits first. Um, [tape cuts out]
…and development; all those plans basically point towards increasing or
trying to get people to use trains to increase parking at existing stations and
that’s definitely what this project does. The new parking offsets the existing
parking demand. We went out about a year ago, maybe a little more… are
you there… we did a parking study and we found out that the 201-surface
parking lot was actually completely at capacity. It was 100% capacity so the
additional 316 spaces as well as the 52 overflow spaces are certainly going
to meet that demand into the future and that will make the station and the
service more attractive to commuters. As I mentioned, it’s going to be a
fully handicapped accessible station with improved safety features and
pedestrian connections and this project is one of several along the Shore
Line East corridor that’s going to make the Shore Line East service more
modern, reliable, and convenient for commuters. It’s also being
implemented to allow for a reverse commute which something that
Governor Rell—we want to have on this service. Right now, transit going towards New Haven during the peak hour in the morning…well we’ll be able to have a reverse commute during that. The parking lot…the 316-space parking lot will also address environmental concerns related to a formal…a former industrial site and I’ll get into this last bullet a little bit more in a few seconds but um, the project is going to replace a undersized culvert that’s substantially clogged and by replacing it with this open span, it’s going to allow tidal flow and exchange to get through the north in the wetlands that are on the project site to the north that are somewhat degraded due to stagnant water and a lot of pragmites. It’s actually going to improve those wetlands in that area.

And I hope this isn’t cut off too much but… these are the culling down of all the assessment that we did. This is pretty much what the impacts are going to be anticipated from this project and I…in the green on the side here is the mitigation that we’re offering up to help offset these impacts. First…first of all there’s aesthetics. There’s going to be some minor visual impacts to some adjacent residential development primarily along Elm Street and Kirkham Street. The backyards of those houses on those streets look over this wetland area that has some low-growing vegetation and you basically can see right into where the station is going to
be and you can see the parking lot lighting. And one of the things that we’re proposing to mitigate that impact is to develop a landscaping plan that has some vegetative components or vegetative buffer that’ll help soften that view impact. Another thing that is going to be done is we’re going to use full cutoff lighting that is dark sky compliant. That’s going to limit…basically those lights will zoom straight down onto the parking lot. It’s going to eliminate light scatter and glare and it’s going to be more appealing to somebody’s eye. You’re not going to have this big…like a baseball field glow.

The wetlands – again I mentioned that culvert replacement. The project, because they’re going to have to take out this constrictive culvert, we’re going to have some impact to tidal wetlands and we’ve estimated it to be about .02 acres which is quite minimal. But by it…through the impact, we’re also going to be putting a new open span, and Dave can talk about this maybe a little bit later, an open span that’s going to allow flow, tidal flow, to get up into those wetlands like I said and it’s going to improve the quality of those wetlands as well as, you know, hopefully get salinity up there to keep down the phragmites. Phragmites tend to grow when you get a lot of freshwater inputs and it’s a degraded system basically. Another thing we’re going to do is fully coordinate our…during the permitting process…with the
Corps, with the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection’s Office of Long Island Sound programs as well as with the Corps of Engineers to insure that the strategy that we come up with to mitigate these wetland impacts is going to be satisfactory and acceptable to them.

As far as water quality – whenever you have…introduce impervious surface to a vegetated area, there’s potential to have water quality impacts from maybe some increased flows or some erosion and sedimentation issues. The construction of that 316-space parking lot is going to introduce some hard surfaces which is going to…is a little bit of a concern for water going into the tidal creeks and so forth so final design, and again, I don’t know if Dave, do you want to talk about this a little at the end, but final design will include primary and secondary storm water renovation measures which will be fully coordinated with the Connecticut DEP to make sure that water quality issues are taken care of. And the project is required to comply with the DEP’s 2004 Storm Water Quality Manual as well as the 2002 Erosion and Sedimentation Control, um, Manual.

There’s going to be three property acquisitions. The large 5.38 acre parcel that is going to accommodate the new parking lot, and then there’s the two smaller pieces, the residential parcel to the north for the kiss-and-ride.
Those all have to be acquired and Mr. Steve Degen is going to talk a little bit about Rights of Way process.

And lastly, whenever you have a project like this, there’s always going to be potential for construction impacts. As I mentioned earlier, this is going to be about a year to a year and a half long construction process. You’re…there’s going to be a potential for temporary noise, air quality and storm water runoff issues during the construction process. And this is typical of just about any construction project we face so some of the ways to alleviate the construction impacts – adhere to a workday schedule that’s during the daytime as much as possible so we don’t have nighttime disturbance. Um, there’s going to be contract bid specifications written up to help reduce diesel emissions as well as to keep noise levels down and light pollution under control. Fugitive dust controls are things like tarps on the back of haul trucks or you know, you would spray down a disturbed area with…that’s unvegetated and, you know, tracking paths can be used on the street to keep the dust down. An erosion and sedimentation control plan will be developed specifically for the project and a health and safety plan will be in place to protect workers for any potential hazards they may encounter on the construction site.
So, um, as Mr. Ike mentioned earlier, there’s three places…four places rather, where the document has already been placed – here at the Library, at the Branford Town’s Clerk’s Office, at the DOT, and at the South Central Regional Council of Governments. And as I mentioned earlier, and you’ll see this on the back of the forms, send any comments that you have…if you don’t talk tonight, send them to Mr. Edgar T. Hurle and it will definitely get into the project record so, at this point I’d like to turn it over to, I guess, Mr. Degen to talk about Right of Way.

**STEVE DEGEN:** Good evening. My name is Steve Degen. I’m here tonight representing the Department of Transportation Office of Rights of Way. The function of the Office of Rights of Way is to acquire all property rights necessary for transportation projects. The property rights will be acquired in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes Sections 13a-73, 13a-98c, 48-50 through 48-57. Sections 48-50 through 48-57 establish your ability to request mediation through the Office of the Ombudsman for Property Rights, to provide information and assistance and mediation concerning disputes of relocation assistance, eminent domain, property owners or to anyone who may be displaced. The Ombudsman is Mr. Robert S. Poliner, 450 Capital Avenue, Hartford. His phone number is 860-418-6356.
Ah, basically the…just one moment. They…I have one party in here that doesn’t pertain to this particular project. Plans as presented for this project indicate three total acquisitions. We did mention that there were four properties involved; one of those properties is the lease, not an acquisition. There is one residential property that is impacted. At the moment the property is vacant and relocation is not necessary. These impacts are subject to change as the project design is refined. Individual notices are sent to each property owner whose land will be affected by the construction of the project. The notice will include a letter explaining the acquisition procedure, the department’s policy, property acquisition brochure and a map showing how much of a person’s property will be affected. Valuation of the property is being prepared to determine the value of the land or easements to be acquired. You or your representative you designate will be given an opportunity to accompany the Right of Way representative on the inspection of the property. This will give you the ability to point out items that you feel contribute to the value of the property. The value is established only after a thorough review of the valuation documents. The Right of Way representative will then arrange an appointment with each property owner to explain the acquisition and present the agency’s determination of just compensation for property rights both orally and in writing. All properties
must normally be acquired prior to the start of construction. If an agreement as to the price cannot be reached, the property will then be acquired under the State’s Power of Eminent Domain. Prior to the commencement of Eminent Domain actions, the property owner will be advised of their rights under the Connecticut General Statutes, Sections 48-50 and 48-52. If the property owner chooses not to exercise their rights under the Connecticut General Statues Section 48-50 through 48-57, a condemnation will be filed and the money offered to you will be deposited through the courts. This money is available to the owner and may be withdrawn without prejudice to that person’s case. The owner may appeal the condemnation award and a hearing will then be scheduled before a State Referee to decide the final compensation to be paid.

Chapter 135 of the General Statutes for the State of Connecticut as revised provides for relocation assistance and other benefits to individuals, families and business displaced by construction projects. Displacees at the initiation of the relocation benefits program will be advised of their rights under Connecticut General Statutes Section 48-52. The Right of Way agent will provide detailed relocation advisory assistance information at the time of negotiations. All monies received under the Relocation Act are tax-free.
Please, if you are involved, please do not move before the offer is made for the purchase of the property. Moving prior to may result in the loss of relocation benefits. At this point in time, I’ll turn the hearing back over to Mr. Ike and he will open up to your questions.

**ROBERT W. IKE:** Thank you Mr. Degen. Since Branford is the host town, I’d like to give the opportunity for the First Selectperson or their representative to make comments. Seeing none, the first speaker on our signup sheet is Lonnie Reed. Please come to the microphone, give your name and address for the record.

**LONNIE REED:** Thank you. Is this okay? My name is Lonnie Reed and I live at 60 Maple Street which is directly across from the train station. I’m also an elected member of the Branford Representative Town Meeting and this is my district and I should also mention that I am the Democratic Nominee for the Connecticut General Assembly 102nd District, and unless I’ve missed overlooked something or missed something, I think I’m pretty much going to Hartford since I don’t think there is an opponent at the moment so having said all that, I am a Maple Street resident. I live directly across as I said, and I also represent the neighborhood. I should say at the outset that I’ve been a regular commuter on trains for much of my life and since my business takes me to New York City frequently, I am a frequent
commuter on Shore Line East, and I have to say that I cannot remember a happier train. I often find my fellow commuters to be almost giddy about the fact that we have this service. They appreciate their service. They support the plans to expand it and to meet the growing demand, and obviously with our current energy crises this is only going to increase. No wonder the current parking lot is at full capacity. I can testify to that. And I was also interested to note that in your EIE report, you made reference to the census data which is a little dated now but it says that at least 65% of our workforce in this town work outside of Branford so obviously it’s only going to be bigger. So clearly I am committed to providing as much mass transit as possible and I believe that it’s a component of a successful master plan to reduce traffic, protect the environment, bolster the economy and enhance our overall quality of life. It’s something we need to be doing as a culture, as a community.

Having said that I would like to encourage you to do everything in your power to insure that the neighbors and their property and the surrounding environment – that they’re all protected if you receive the final go ahead and go forward with this new construction to add 316 new parking spaces, a northern platform, a pedestrian bridge and a kiss-and-ride – I was calling it the kiss-and-drop. I guess mine was a little harsh; a kiss-and-ride
I am hearing concerns from long time residents of this area, that they’re fearful that dangerous contaminants from the MIF Factory across the street were dumped there on that site back in the day, and that construction is going to stir it up and send it on a very dangerous journey. I was reading your EIE report; it’s clear that you have noticed that the area is degraded. I’m assuming that you’re going to take every step possible to mitigate any kind of potential harm. I also was happy to see that you’re going to enlarge that culvert because I think that’s very important to kind of flush that stream, and that you’re making plans to improve the area with the storm water runoff design – something that is really, you know, a terrific thing that you’re actually going to enhance the area.

So in closing I just want to say that I would urge everybody involved in this project to make every effort to insure that the neighbors and all of the concerned Branford citizens are made to feel that they are being kept in the loop every step of the way. We in Branford like to be kept in the loop. Um, as you’ve undoubtedly discovered there are a lot of very talented people in Branford, whether they’re elected or working for the Town or volunteers – a lot of talent in this town and everybody wants to help you in every way possible to make this a really great experience and to enhance our Town and the whole region. So I thank you very much…
ROBERT W. IKE: Thank you very much. Scott Merrick… Please come to the microphone, give your name and your address please.

SCOTT MERRICK: All right. My name is Scott Merrick. I live at 23 Curve Street and the new lot is going to be right behind my house. Most of the things Lonnie’s already mentioned but, ah, would like to reiterate them.

Light pollution -- currently the lights… I don’t know if they have the lighting you’re talking about in the existing lot but, ah, they shine through my windows brightly. So if they’re the same lights, they don’t work. Ah, toxins in the back – I’ve sent rusted out barrels back there as I wander around. The creek is awful back there. When you open up the culvert I’m not sure if that’s running from the creek under Maple Street, that seems to be where it gets backed up but, ah, the traffic that that’s going to cause on the other end of Maple Street. Storm water runoff – again, it’s a beautiful area. The other concern I have is sort of security. I can’t tell what trees you’re going to leave in there between the lots or what sort of use you’re going to have from I believe it’s ___ Street Extension down by the corner where it turns into West End Road but if it’s backed up, you know, what sort of security is going to be provided. Are the trees going to be cut away? Just don’t want lousy aspects in the neighborhood. Thank you.

JANICE PLAZIAK: I’m Janice Plaziak. I’m the Town Engineer for the Town of Branford and I live at 41 Crab Apple Lane in Guilford. Um, I just was attending tonight to learn more about the project. I appreciate your recent cooperation with my office, providing us with information regarding the project. I believe you understand that the Town of Branford for which I believe I speak is in support of the project and look forward to some further cooperation; some of the details to be worked out with regard to impacts to neighborhoods, streets, intersections, adjacent sidewalks.

ROBERT W. IKE: Thank you. Our last speaker – Karl Hoszak [phonetic]? Did I say that right? I guess they’ve gone. Are there any other first time speakers? Any first time speakers? Any second time speakers? Anybody like to speak second? Do we have any speakers? Any more speakers?

Well, seeing no other speakers, on behalf of Commissioner Joseph F. Marie, I would like to thank you for coming and expressing your views tonight. Please remember that you have until August 21st, 2008 to submit any postmarked comments to the Connecticut Department of Transportation. Thank you and have a good evening. Yes, I’ll take it. Yes, Ma’am.
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APPENDIX E

Written Comments Received During the Public Comment Period
(July 8, 2008 through August 21, 2008)
July 17, 2008

Mr. Edgar T. Hurle, Transportation Planning Director  
Connecticut Department of Transportation  
2800 Berlin Turnpike  
Newington, CT 06131-7546

Re: Environmental Impact Evaluation for Infrastructure Improvements to the Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station

Dear Mr. Hurle:

The following comments are offered in response to your request concerning the improvements to the Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station located at Meadow Street and Kirkham Street, Branford, CT. A review of the environmental impact evaluation indicates that infrastructure improvements would consist of construction of a new north-side high level rail platform, a pedestrian bridge over the active rail line connecting the north-side and south-side platforms, and a new expanded surface parking.

The following summarizes the Department’s position with regard to lead and asbestos issues:

A. Lead-Based Paint:

It does not appear that renovation; demolition, excavation or construction activities associated with this project are subject to the Department of Public Health (DPH) Lead Poisoning Prevention and Control (LPPPC) Regulations (§§19a-111-1 through 19a-111-11).

There are, however, other issues that must be addressed related to lead-based paint. Among these issues are the following:

- Lead-based paint testing of paint on existing structures marked for demolition, or sampling for lead-in-soils should be performed by a lead inspector or lead inspector/risk assessor certified by the DPH.
- Planned renovation, demolition or soil removal activities should be performed using lead-safe work practices.
- If lead-based paint or lead contaminated soil is identified, the classification and disposal of generated waste must comply with the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) and Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection standards (i.e. Toxicity Characteristics Leaching Procedure [TCLP] testing, reporting, and record keeping requirements).
Additionally, if lead-based paint, lead containing paint, or lead contaminated soil is identified, workers must be trained (as a minimum) according to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) lead standard (29 CFR 1926.62). Because other contaminants may also be present on the site, additional health and safety training may be required (e.g., hazardous waste and/or asbestos).

In addition there are other issues that must be addressed related to lead-based paint. Among these issues are the following:

- Any testing of paint on existing structures must be performed by a lead inspector or lead inspector/risk assessor certified by the DPH.
- Planned rehabilitation, renovation, or demolition activities should be performed using lead-safe work practices.
- Additionally, if lead-based paint or lead containing paint is identified, workers must be trained (as a minimum) according to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) lead standard (29 CFR 1926.62). Because other contaminants may also be present on the site, additional health and safety training may be required (e.g., hazardous waste and/or asbestos).
- If lead-based paint or lead containing paint is identified on any of the structures, the classification and disposal of generated waste must comply with the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) and Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection standards (e.g., Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure [TCLP] testing, and reporting and record keeping requirements by the contractor).

Additional inquiries on the subject of lead-based paint should be directed to Alan Buzzetti, Supervising Environmental Analyst, Lead Poisoning Prevention and Control Program at (860) 509-7299.

B. Asbestos:

Any demolition of existing facilities that are associated with this proposed project would be subject to the provisions of the asbestos National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (40 CFR Part 61). As such, the facilities would be required to be thoroughly inspected to determine the presence of asbestos prior to the commencement of the demolition activity. The asbestos inspection must be conducted by an Inspector or a Management Planner licensed by the DPH. Asbestos abatement that involves more than three (3) linear feet or more than three (3) square feet of asbestos containing material must be performed by an asbestos abatement contractor licensed by the DPH. Asbestos abatement must be performed in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local regulations.

Additional inquiries regarding any issues related to asbestos should be directed to Ronald Skomro, Supervising Environmental Analyst, Asbestos Program at (860) 509-7367.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Suzanne Blanchfield, MS, Chief
Environmental Health Section

C: J. Smith, Office of Policy Management
July 9, 2008

Mr. Edgar T Hurle, Transportation Planning Director
Department of Transportation
2800 Berlin Turnpike
Newington, CT 06106

RE: Notice of EIE for the Branford Shore Line East Railroad Station

Dear Mr. Hurle:

The Drinking Water Section of the Department of Public Health has reviewed the above-mentioned project for potential impacts to any sources of public drinking water supply. This project does not appear to be in a public water supply source water area, therefore the Drinking Water Section has no comments at this time.

Sincerely,

Lori Mathieu
Public Health Services Manager
Drinking Water Section
The Department of Environmental Protection has reviewed the Environmental Impact Evaluation for proposed improvements to the Shore Line East Railroad Station in Branford. The following commentary is submitted for your consideration.

As indicated in our scoping comments, the Department supports efforts to expand the capacity of public transportation services such as Shore Line East, especially given its potential to reduce vehicle miles traveled and congestion in the I-95 corridor. The use of public transit will decrease vehicular emissions that contribute to ozone formation, particulate matter levels and climate change. As noted in the EIE, enhancing commuter rail service is a common theme in state, regional and local plans of conservation and development.

The Wetlands section beginning on page 43 states that a tidal survey in January 2008 mapped the high tide line. It is not clear whether a certified soil scientist performed a reconnaissance of the site in order to determine whether there are any areas which would be regulated as wetlands or watercourses as defined by section 22a-38 (15) and (16) of the Connecticut General Statutes (CGS), respectively. If one has not already been done, it is recommended that a site reconnaissance be performed in order to ensure that this is not the case.

With regard to tidal wetlands and tidal waters waterward of the high tide line, the impact of the new tidal creek crossing is estimated to be 720 sq.ft. In addition, there is a riprap splash pad associated with the outfall for the detention pond. It is not clear from the plans if the riprap is being proposed waterward of the high tide line. If so, ConnDOT will need to provide appropriate justification for the size and volume of material. Page 46 notes that work below the high tide line and mitigation (restoration) will be coordinated with DEP. The appropriate contact in the Office of Long Island Sound Programs (OLISP) is Susan Jacobson, who may be reached at (860) 424-3693 or susan.jacobson@ct.gov.

The EIE presents a conceptual approach to stormwater management appropriate for CEPA review. The following comments are offered as recommendations to ConnDOT as design proceeds. The appropriate contact for further guidance is Karen Allen of the Permitting & Enforcement Division, who may be reached at (860) 424-3842 or karen.allen@ct.gov.
As noted on page 40, the project will disturb more than one acre, so ConnDOT will need to register for the construction stormwater general permit. A site-specific Stormwater Pollution Control Plan meeting the requirements of the general permit must be prepared for the project but does not need to be submitted with the registration because there will be less than 10 acres of disturbance.

The Department encourages the use of as much pervious area as possible, where subsurface contamination is not a concern. As noted on page 39, pervious asphalt may be considered for the kiss-and-ride area and overflow parking lot. Pervious concrete or pavers would also be options worth consideration.

The extent of the subsurface contamination was not shown on any of the drawings. The document says that the pavement for the new parking lot will be serving as the cap for the contamination, implying that areas beyond the pavement are not contaminated. This should be clarified, particularly with regard to the area of the detention basin. Soil testing for contamination, infiltration rates and depth to seasonal high water table will be required for the design of the basin.

The construction stormwater general permit contains the requirement that “any site which has a post-construction stormwater discharge that is located less than 500 feet from a tidal wetlands which is not a fresh-tidal wetlands, shall discharge such stormwater through a system designed to retain the volume of stormwater runoff generated by 1 inch of rainfall on the site.” This is to minimize the impacts of fresh water on the salinity of the tidal wetlands. The document indicates that the detention/retention basin will be used to treat the first 1” inch of runoff from the site for sediments and to maintain the same pre- and post-construction volume of stormwater discharging from the site. The use of an impermeable liner prevents infiltration and would not meet the requirements of the stormwater general permit. The issue may be moot however, if the seasonal high groundwater table or contamination prevents infiltration at this location. This topic will require further discussion with ConnDOT during permitting.

Catch basins #1 and #2 appear to be located in a grassy swale designed to accept some of the parking lot runoff before discharging to the detention basin. Perhaps this area could be designed as a rain garden. There appear to be only 6 catch basins total for the new parking area. For large parking lots, the Department typically recommends that a hydrodynamic separator, incorporating swirl technology, circular screening technology or engineered cylindrical sedimentation technology, to remove medium to coarse grained sediments and oil or grease. A hydrodynamic separator would be beneficial, but may not be necessary for this system. Deep sump, hooded catch basins possibly outfitted with appropriate catch basin inserts may serve as a sufficient alternative.

Page 58 notes that efforts will be made to retain as much of the existing tree buffer as practicable at the edges of the proposed lot to minimize visual impacts. This would also yield water quality benefits by reducing thermal impacts. The landscaping plan should incorporate natural vegetation to provide shading for both the paved areas and the detention basin to the greatest extent possible.
The site of the proposed 316-space parking lot has been historically contaminated by foundry sand and manufacturing wastes. The EIE references a preliminary site assessment performed by Storch Associates in 1993. Although the document does not contain enough information to provide additional guidance at this time, page 54 states that the Remedial Action Plan will be fully coordinated with DEP. The appropriate contact is Thomas RisCassi of the Remediation Division. He may be reached at (860) 424-3781 or thomas.riscassi@ct.gov.

After a brief discussion of an EPA Voluntary Diesel Retrofit Program, page 64 states that "ConnDOT will require contractors to comply with current best management practices." It is not clear whether measure similar to the Connecticut Clean Air Construction Initiative employed by ConnDOT for the Q-Bridge projects will be implemented. For construction projects in urban areas, the Department typically recommends the use of construction equipment that has the best available controls on diesel emissions. Equipment, such as diesel oxidation catalysts or particulate filters, or the use of ultra-low sulfur fuel (15 ppm sulfur) can be effective in reducing exhaust emissions. The Department also recommends the use of diesel oxidation catalysts or diesel particulate filters for pre 2007-model year on-road vehicles typically used in construction projects. These on-road vehicles include dump trucks, fuel delivery trucks and other vehicles typically found at construction sites.

An additional mitigation measure, compliance with Section 22a-174-18(b)(3)(C) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies that limits the idling of mobile sources to 3 minutes, is noted on page 66. Use of posted signs indicating the three-minute idling limit is recommended. It is also recommended that contract specifications include language similar to the anti-idling regulations to allow enforcement of idling restrictions at the project site without the involvement of the Department.

The document does not mention any plans to better accommodate bicyclists at the railroad station. (There are two small bike racks at the existing facility.) In our scoping comments, the Department endorsed the recommendation for bicycle racks at Shore Line East facilities contained in the South Central Regional Long Range Transportation Plan 2007 - 2035. Adding bicycle parking to the station would be a low-cost, space-saving method of increasing train ridership. Long-term bicycle parking should provide commuters a secure and weather-protected place to store their bicycles. These can be an existing overhang or covered walkway, a special covering, weatherproof outdoor bicycle lockers, or an indoor storage area. The Department urges that provision of appropriate bicycle storage be included in the design for the upgraded Branford station.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. If there are any questions regarding these comments, please contact me.

cc: Robert Kaliszewski, DEP/OPPD  
    Robert Hannon, DEO/OPPD  
    Karen Allen, DEP/PED  
    Jeff Caiola, DEP/IWRD  
    John Gaucher, DEP/OLISP  
    Susan Jacobson, DEP/OLISP  
    Ellen Pierce, DEP/APSD  
    Thomas RisCassi, DEP/RD
I submit these comments on behalf of 35 Maple Street, LLC.

We have reviewed the materials provided by the Department of Transportation at the Public Hearing on August 7, 2008. We have also reviewed the July 2008 Environmental Impact Evaluation with Regard to the Branford Shoreline East Railroad Station -- Project Nos. 310-0047 and 310-0048. We respectfully submit the following comments:

We fully support the Connecticut DOT's ongoing commitment to expand commuter rail services in keeping with Governor M. Jodie Rell's Transportation Initiative, which was passed by the Legislature in 2005. In fact, we agree with and fully support the Project Purpose And Need as set forth in the materials distributed to the public at the August 7th hearing. In addition, the proposed north-side high level rail platform, the pedestrian bridge over the rail line to connect the north-side and south-side platforms, the kiss-and-ride drop off area, and the re-use of the former rail station parking lot all appear to be very appropriate and supported by the information provided. However, the seizure of 5.38 acres of private property to create a new 316 space surface parking lot is not justified or supported by the materials provided. With regard to that limited portion of the project we respectfully request that consideration be given to a viable alternative that is available. Such an alternative will increase the amount of parking, will decrease the environmental impact of the proposed project, increase the tax revenue to the Town of Branford and avoid seizure of private property - which should only be done as a last resort.

The materials provided at the public hearing and the July 2008 evaluation relied upon by Connecticut DOT in support of the proposal to seize the 5.38 acres of property is fundamentally and fatally flawed. At its core, the proposal evaluates two alternatives described as a "no action alternative" or "build alternative." Obviously, the "no action alternative" is not a viable option and further discussion of that suggestion is specious. The "build alternative" option states that its parking analysis is premised upon a July 2001 parking study that set a parking space goal of 400-500 parking spaces. It goes on to state that the July 2001 analysis focused on several possible sites for potential surface parking but that the other sites were either too small or might pose safety concerns. Based upon this analysis, they conclude the only option is the utilization of 5.38 acres of private property, which can be obtained at a "relatively low cost." The problem with this analysis is that it wholly neglects to consider a perfectly viable alternative that would not pose a problem with location or safety and avoids the distasteful seizure of private property, namely a parking garage at the existing site.

All of the Governor's goals and the Project Purpose could be met simply by creating a parking garage in the area of the existing parking lot. This would avoid the seizure of private property and given the topography of the current parking lot in relation to the surrounding area, it would fit nicely in the area. Furthermore, several other reasons establish that a parking garage would pose a better alternative to this project than the proposed surface parking lot. Although the 5.38 parcel of property is currently vacant it is actually zoned as industrial property and plans have already been submitted, and a development project underway, to develop that parcel in a responsible manner. Thus, although the Connecticut DOT cites the placement of a surface parking lot on the parcel as an environmental improvement (over the existing condition), a fair comparison requires an analysis of the already proposed development plan versus the surface parking lot. When that comparison is performed the surface parking lot is deficient. Second, the
effects on the Town's tax base (if private property is seized) as opposed to being developed must also be considered. If the property is developed in accordance with its private development plan, there will be a significant tax benefit to the town. By comparison, if this private property is seized by the state, it will actually reduce the tax revenue to the Town.

Finally, if the only concern about building a parking garage is the minor interruption of the existing parking spaces, the owners of the private property are willing to license to the State the right to utilize their property (and in essence temporarily delay their private development project) for use as surface parking while the parking garage is being built. Space can be obtained at a relatively low cost to off-set the inconvenience during construction.
I strongly support the proposed expansion of the Branford Railroad Station. Improved mass transit, in particular rail facilities, are critically important for economic and environmental sustainability and for quality of life of residents of Branford and the rest of the Shoreline region.

The State should also work with the Town of Branford to create a public transit feeder system that will enable residents to get to the railroad station without driving private automobiles.

Capacity for buses should be included to encourage the use of such low-impact methods of commuting.

(Optional)
Name: Bill Home
Address: 246 Pleasant Point Road
       Branford, CT 06405
Affiliation: 

Please deposit this form in the comment sheet box at tonight’s meeting or fold it in half and mail to the address provided on the back. Alternatively, fax the form to Mr. Edgar T. Hurle at (860) 594-3377. Comments may also be emailed to Mr. Hurle at edgar.hurle@post.state.ct.us. All comments must be received by August 21, 2008.
APPENDIX F

Responses to Comments
PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPT COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
(Refer to numbered comments in the right-hand margin of the transcript included in Appendix D)

Comment #1 - Lonnie Reed

Response: Comments noted and acknowledged. The mitigation committed to for this project includes monitoring for and proper handling and disposal of any hazardous materials encountered. Additionally, CTDOT is committed to ongoing public information regarding project implementation.

Comment #2 - Scott Merrick

Response: Comments noted. In response to the concerns expressed, mitigation for the project will include:

- Landscaping, vegetative buffers, and appropriate dark-sky compliant illumination will help to minimize and mitigate any visual impacts to the surrounding neighborhood.
- Plans and specifications will be generated by CTDOT to address any on-site contamination issues. These will include material handling and disposal requirements and health and safety measures to be undertaken during construction. As part of this, CTDOT will also be registering under the CTDEP "General Permit for Contaminated Soil and/or Sediment Management (Staging and Transfer)".
- New safety features such as fencing and illumination added to provide for safety of both commuters and residents near the station site.

Regarding traffic, CTDOT will be submitting a major traffic generator application to the State Traffic Commission (STC) for this project. The application will include a detailed traffic analysis of the surrounding roadway network. CTDOT is committed to providing any traffic mitigation measures deemed necessary by the STC for this project.

Comment #3 - Janice Plaziak

Response: Comment noted and acknowledged
WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM STATE AGENCIES, LEGISLATORS AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

Comment #4 - Connecticut Department of Public Health: Environmental Health Section

Response: The project will require the demolition of the residential structure located at 14 Kirkham Street in Branford. CTDOT has already conducted a Pre-demolition Investigative Survey for Hazardous Building Materials (including lead, asbestos, and other identified hazardous and CT-regulated materials, wastes, and other items) and specifications have been prepared to address all demolition issues associated with this property.

Comment #5 - Connecticut Department Public Health: Drinking Water Section

Response: Comments noted and acknowledged

Comments #6 – Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection

Response: CTDOT has committed to ongoing coordination with CTDEP during construction and permitting for the Proposed Action. All recommendations made in this comment letter regarding the design of the stormwater management system, construction period air quality protection measures, and landscaping are acknowledged and will be considered during final design. Responses to specific points of concern include:

a. Reconnaissance of the wetlands, including tidal wetlands on and adjacent to the Proposed Action site was performed by Mr. David Laiuppa, a certified soils scientist employed by Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc. Wetland reconnaissance was conducted on May 5, 2008.

b. Final design of the new facility will be fully coordinated with the CTDEP and ACOE and will include primary and secondary stormwater renovation measures. This will include consultation and concurrence on the final design of the detention pond and any associated riprap material. The rip-rap splash pads associated with the outfalls of the detention pond will be located above the elevation of the high tide line and outside of regulated wetlands.

c. The need for a stormwater permit and stormwater pollution control plan has been acknowledged in the EIE and will be obtained. CTDOT will coordinate stormwater details with the CTDEP during the permitting process to ensure that all stormwater issues raised by the CTDEP in this comment are adequately resolved. This includes among other items, the final design of the detention basin, outfalls, catch basins, and other stormwater treatment measures. Soil testing for contamination, infiltration rates, and to ascertain the depth to the seasonal high water table will also be conducted during final design. A landscaping plan designed to incorporate natural vegetation to provide shading for portions of the paved parking surface and detention
basin will also be considered by CTDOT and coordinated with the CTDEP during the project’s permitting phase.

d. As discussed during a meeting held on October 1, 2008 with Thomas RisCassi of the CTDEP Remediation Division, a supplemental investigation of the site was conducted by Tetra Tech Rizzo in 2008 with somewhat lower levels of contamination from what was encountered during the previous investigation by Storch Associates. As there is no enforcement action or mandated remediation (such as a significant environmental hazard) for the site, CTDOT will not be preparing a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) for the site. However, plans and specifications will be generated to address the on-site contamination issues. These will include material handling and disposal requirements and health and safety measures to be undertaken during construction. As part of this, CTDOT will also be registering under the CTDEP "General Permit for Contaminated Soil and/or Sediment Management (Staging and Transfer)".

e. CTDOT will require contractors to comply with current best management practices. Best management practices include the control and abatement of dust, mist, smoke, vapor, gas, aerosol, other particulate matter, odorous substances and any combination thereof arising from project operations. CTDOT will recommend the use of ultra-low sulfur fuel, as well as the use of the most modern construction equipment (Tier II and Tier III). CTDOT will require the contractor to comply with the anti-idling requirements of Section 22a-174-18(b)(3)(C) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, while also recommending that a mitigation plan be developed to abate impacts to identified sensitive receptors, which include schools, hospitals, daycare etc. and the recommended use of truck staging areas.

f. The recommendation for additional bicycle parking is acknowledged and will be incorporated into final design for the Proposed Action
WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE PUBLIC

Comment #7 - 35 Maple LLC

Response: Responses to the individual concerns raised in the comment letter are as follows:

a. The construction of a parking garage on the site of the current surface parking lot is problematic for a number of reasons. First, displacement of nearly 200 commuters parking at the lot would be necessary for the approximate 18-month duration of construction. While temporary, this is still a long duration for site users. Few if any other parcels within reasonable walking distance exist to meet that interim demand. In addition, sites for temporary parking would require the use of private property, which could include a variety of unknown unacceptable impacts for those property owners.

Second, garages should be self sustaining. In other words, revenue collected at the facility should cover its operation and maintenance costs. As Shore Line East does not charge for parking, in part to attract additional riders, building a no charge parking garage will cost significantly more than surface parking even after payment of right of way acquisition costs.

Third, it is not clear if the town supports a parking garage at that site. Parking garages can pose neighborhood cohesion impacts including introducing a structure that is inconsistent with the scale and character of the existing neighborhood. The resulting structure would likely be higher than the abutting Anchor Reef development and could exceed local zoning requirements.

Fourth, constructing a surface parking lot on a property with suspected environmental contamination issues represents responsible reuse of a Brownfield type property.

b. CTDOT obtained a copy of the plans filed with the Town of Branford for this site. Site plan approval was granted by the Branford Planning and Zoning Commission on November 20, 2008. The CTDEP has issued a letter identifying some concerns with the proposed private development scheme for this site due to its constraints both in terms of tidal wetlands and potential contamination as a Brownfields site. The Proposed Action to be undertaken by CTDOT would address these concerns and improve environmental quality through coordinated design of the surface parking on the site. CTDOT will generate plans and specifications to address on site contamination issues. These plans will include material handling and disposal requirements and health and safety measures to be undertaken during construction. The private development scheme for the site does not offer similar remediation guarantees at this time.

c. As noted above, the potential for realization of the development plans for this site are unknown and the associated tax revenue to the Town of Branford cannot be confirmed or assured at this time. Nonetheless, the Payment in Lieu of Taxes or
PILOT program will offset the potential tax-loss to the town and will be employed to address the tax implications of the Proposed Action.

d. The cost to build a “temporary” parking lot, including private property agreements and the necessary acquisition of CTDEP permits to construct as well as limited availability of feasible sites to do so make this alternative impractical.

Comment #8 - Bill Horne

Response: Comments noted and acknowledged